

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3941. A bill to amend section 2 of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 3942. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters and supervisors of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 3943. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3944. A bill authorizing the prosecution of the work of improvement for purposes of beach erosion control at Atlantic City, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. Res. 218. Resolution authorizing the Committee on House Administration to increase the telephone and telegraph allowance for Members of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 219. Resolution providing for the printing as a House document of the address of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur delivered to the Congress on April 19, 1951; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3945. A bill for the relief of Cosmo Casati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3946. A bill for the relief of Master Sgt. Orval Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 3947. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make an allotment of certain land to Pauline Acosta Dumont; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3948. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make an allotment of certain land to Jasper Palou; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 3949. A bill for the relief of Angelo Bosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 3950. A bill for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3951. A bill for the relief of Leon Alex Piechowiak, alias Leon Piechowiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3952. A bill for the relief of Ivan R. Wold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 3953. A bill for the relief of Chan Toy Har; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

264. By Mr. CANFIELD: Letter from the Honorable Walter T. Margetts, Jr., treasurer

of the State of New Jersey, opposing Secretary Snyder's recommendation that the excise tax on distilled spirits be increased from \$9 to \$12 per gallon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

265. Also, resolution adopted by the New Jersey Highway Users Conference, Trenton, N. J., opposing Secretary of the Treasury Snyder's proposal to double the Federal gasoline tax rate and increase the Federal excise taxes on new automobiles to 20 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

* The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, to the white altar of Thy grace in the brightness of this new morning we come, bowing in our ignorance and weakness, praying for strength and wisdom to face with courage the somber specters that stalk the darkened earth.

Through the angry emotions of present days help us to seek not the vindication of our opinions, but the truth that shall make us free. Save us from presumptive pride that feigns an understanding that it does not possess. If we secretly covet the superior gifts of others, if we inwardly rejoice in the failure of others, if we give hospitality to thoughts that debase and degrade, if we are satisfied with anything short of our best, if we have readily and perhaps eagerly believed the worst about others, if we have judged our fellows on flimsy and perhaps false reports; if in any human relationship we have been untrue, unfair, unbrotherly: O Thou, who takest away the sin of the world, forgive us, cleanse us, renew us, restore our souls and lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy Name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 2, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3790)

making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HUNT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and continuing for a period of 10 days, on official business of the Committee on Armed Services.

On request of Mr. JENNER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAPEHART was excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. KILGORE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office of the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which is studying amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL DEPUTY SERGEANT AT ARMS FOR A LIMITED PERIOD

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a paper designating Darrell St. Claire as Special Deputy Sergeant at Arms for a limited period.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1951.

In accordance with authority conferred on me by Senate resolution agreed to December 17, 1889 (Senate Journal 47, 51-1, December 17, 1889), I hereby appoint Darrell St. Claire a Special Deputy Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate for the period from May 3, 1951, to May 7, 1951, to perform in my absence any and all duties required of or devolving upon the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate by law or by the rules or orders of the Senate.

JOSEPH C. DUKE,
Sergeant at Arms,
United States Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other

routine business, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. AIKEN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Joint resolution eulogizing the achievements of Gen. Douglas MacArthur

"Whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur brought glory and renown to the military personnel under his command during World War II with distinction and honor to himself and country; and

"Whereas by his efficient administration of postwar Japan, that country is now ready to accept her right place among the other free nations of the world; and

"Whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur has fought a distinguished and able fight in Korea with but limited means at his disposal, and has shown himself to be one of the greatest generals of our country; and

"Whereas we learn with sincere regret of his recall from his post of command of all United Nations forces: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That we extend to Gen. Douglas MacArthur our sincere and heartfelt recognition of his leadership and our pride in his accomplishments, our faith in his integrity and our confidence in his loyalty to all who served under his command, and that we voice that faith by acclamation and inscribe this resolution in the acts of the general assembly of 1951; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send to Gen. Douglas MacArthur a certified copy of this resolution and certified copies of this resolution to the members of the congressional delegation of Vermont.

"WALLACE M. FAY,

"Speaker of the house of representatives.

"JOSEPH B. JOHNSON,

"President of the senate.

"Approved April 27, 1951.

"LEE E. EMERSON,

"Governor."

RESOLUTIONS OF NEBRASKA STOCK GROWERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, three resolutions I have received from the Nebraska Stock Growers Association. These resolutions deal with the necessity for maintaining our economic stability, keeping our Na-

tion strong, and avoiding unnecessary and restrictive regulations on industry, particularly the livestock industry. I agree with the sentiments expressed in these resolutions 100 percent.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and referred, as follows:

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution I

"Declaration of policy and program

"To the fundamental American principles of democracy, as expressed in our two great declarations of American principles—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America—we enthusiastically give our eternal allegiance. Those principles are America. They brought about the development of this country to the greatness that has been hers.

"We abhor all efforts to take from any one of the principles that make our country. We condemn every one and every effort to destroy or injure any one of these principles.

"The current international crisis and the national emergency resulting therefrom is being felt by every individual and every home in the country. This serious problem confronting every American must be met with foresight, with fearlessness, and with sound common sense.

"Our Nation is preparing for a state of total mobilization for war; American boys are giving their lives on the battlefields of Korea. Yet with international diplomatic negotiations in full swing, a stalemate of power politics appears to have been reached which may continue for years to come. Such a situation, if prolonged indefinitely, may tax the strength of this Nation beyond endurance unless a definite long-range policy is established by our Federal Government which will set up a sound and practical goal for which we must strive.

"The productive ability of America under the free-enterprise system in all fields of endeavor stands today as the real bulwark against the aggression threatening our freedom. The American people can maintain this position only so long as the economy of this Nation remains strong. We cannot continue to make other nations strong by programs which will make our Nation weak.

"On the home front we condemn waste and extravagance in our Federal Government; we oppose the principles of price controls, subsidy payments and other governmental regulations not compatible with our American way of life.

"We therefore petition the Congress and the President of the United States to outline a policy and to establish certain definite principles indicating the extent to which this Nation will attempt to control through military influence (I) the protection of this Nation and the hemisphere against aggression; (II) to prevent the growth of communistic influence throughout the world; and (III) a program consistent with the economic stability of the United States over a long period of time.

"We believe this will contribute to the complete support of our citizenship and to the lasting protection of our freedom."

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolution II

"Controls

"Whereas this country has, during the past few months, again entered upon a period of governmental controls over civilian life and economy; and

"Whereas the experiences undergone during the similar period of controls throughout the wartime are still fresh in our minds, we now express our beliefs and our position upon these questions injected into our lives by the system of controls; and

"Whereas we know, as we have always known and as experience has demonstrated that the livestock industry is one element of our economy that is not susceptible to Government controls because they are neither practicable nor enforceable. And we further know that such efforts to control will certainly result in disruption of supplies and a disgraceful black-market condition; and

"Whereas we know that not only is it impractical to establish or attempt to enforce ceiling prices on live animals but any effort to follow such a route would inevitably injure and retard production—and increased production is one of the two principal answers to the major question; and

"Whereas the other principal answer is economy in government. To stabilize our economy, unnecessary expenditure of public funds by the Government must be stopped; and

"Whereas foolish regulations, such as the contemplated prohibition of calf slaughter, allocations, and the threat or inspiration of rumors and threats of such regulations must be stopped. Every such regulation or threat is an obstacle to increased production and an influence toward reduced production when the opposite is the desired goal: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association is opposed to Government controls on our industry, as they are not only completely unenforceable but lead to confusion and shortages."

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution III

"Ranch and farm labor

"Whereas it is an obvious fact that the production of livestock is an essential industry because from livestock comes meat, leather, pharmaceutical supplies, and other strategic materials requisite to the success of the vast programs being undertaken by our country and the essential character of our industry must be recognized by the Government just as is every other industry engaged in the production of strategic materials; and

"Whereas the adoption by this country of a program of military training and the mobilization of men for such military service creates a serious question affecting the ability of our industry to produce livestock in quantities required by the Nation; and

"Whereas, although we do not request or expect any special or particular treatment or consideration, we do request and expect treatment of our labor problems on the same basis as is accorded all other strategic industries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association respectfully requests the Federal Government, the State, and the Selective Service Board, in its administration of the laws, present and to be adopted, relating to military service, give due consideration to the character of the work being done by men in our industry and that essential keymen be not withdrawn from their important, strategic work for the military service, just as such consideration is given to similar men in other strategic industries."

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF INTERNATIONAL FALLS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution unanimously adopted by the City Council of the City of International Falls, Minn., at its regular meeting on March 19, 1951, urging immediate hearings on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the city of International Falls and surrounding territory are vitally interested in the St. Lawrence waterway project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of International Falls in regular session assembled, That we urge the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to call immediate hearings on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to members of said Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—RESOLUTION OF BROWN COUNTY RURAL ELECTRICAL ASSOCIATION, SLEEPY EYE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Brown County Rural Electrical Association, Sleepy Eye, Minn., at its annual meeting on March 8, 1951, in support of the St. Lawrence waterway.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Brown County Rural Electrical Association is today holding its annual meeting at Sleepy Eye, Minn.; and

Whereas said association represents approximately 2,800 farm families located in Brown County and parts of Nicollet and Sibley Counties, Minn.; and

Whereas we believe that the development of the St. Lawrence waterway will provide a reasonable and economical means of transportation for the Midwest; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence waterway will provide electric power in the northeastern part of the United States: Now, therefore, we delegates to the 1951 annual meeting of the Brown County REA strongly urge our Representatives in Congress and in the Senate to strongly support the plan now proposed for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to every Minnesota Member of Congress and to our two United States Senators.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association, Danube, Minn., at its annual meeting on March 21, 1951, urging the development of the Missouri Valley Authority and the construction of transmission lines.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY RESOLUTION

Whereas the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association is today, March 21, 1951, holding its annual meeting at Danube, Minn.; and

Whereas said association represents approximately 2,200 farm families located in Renville County and parts of Nicollet, Sibley and Chippewa Counties in Minnesota; and

Whereas an ample supply of power at fair prices is essential to the operation and growth of our association; and

Whereas the Federal Government is building dams on the Missouri River and has established the Missouri Valley Authority; and

Whereas it has been proven that an abundance of economical power from said Missouri River can be transmitted to the territory served by the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association; and

Whereas hearings have been held before a House Appropriations Committee to consider the appropriation of funds for the construction of a transmission line by the Bureau of Reclamation for approval by the Department of Interior in the territory served by the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we as delegates to the 1951 annual meeting of the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association strongly urge Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota to give their whole-hearted support to the development of the Missouri Valley Authority and to consider construction of transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior into the areas served by our Association; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all the Minnesota Congressmen and Senators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Brown County Rural Electrical Association, Sleepy Eye, Minn., at its annual meeting on March 8, 1951, in support of the Missouri Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Brown County Rural Electrical Association is today holding its annual meeting at Sleepy Eye, Minn.; and

Whereas said association represents approximately 2,800 farm families located in Brown County and parts of Nicollet and Sibley Counties, Minn.; and

Whereas an ample supply of power at a fair price is essential to the operation and growth of our association; and

Whereas, because of the tremendous growth in the use of power by members of our association, available sources of power can no longer supply our needs at a fair price; and

Whereas the Federal Government is building dams on the Missouri River and has established the Missouri Valley Authority; and

Whereas it has been proven that abundant and economical power from said Missouri River can be transmitted to the territory served by the Brown County REA; and

Whereas hearings have been held before a House Appropriations Committee to consider the appropriation of funds for the construction of a transmission line by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior in the territory served by the Brown County REA: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we delegates to the 1951 annual meeting of the Brown County REA strongly urge Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota to give their whole-hearted support to the development of the Missouri Valley Authority and to the construction of transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior into the area served by our association; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all the Minnesota Congressmen and Senators.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 3297. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 309).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, Thursday, May 3, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 300. An act for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart;

S. 451. An act for the relief of James McGillic and Blossom McGillic;

S. 464. An act for the relief of Willard Cheek and Louise Cheek;

S. 568. An act for the relief of George W. Purdy;

S. 613. An act for the relief of Ernestine Bacon Jacobs;

S. 768. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and M. F. Quinn;

S. 803. An act to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General; and

S. 998. An act to facilitate the financing of the defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1428. A bill for the relief of John Tzanavaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1429. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when movement is arranged for, or on behalf of, the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

S. 1430. A bill to appropriate funds for flood protection of Barbourville, Ky.; and

S. 1431. A bill to appropriate funds for flood protection of Pineville, Ky.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. J. Res. 69, Joint resolution authorizing the Commissioner of Public Roads to designate a transcontinental highway system to be known as the Crozet Superhighway; to the Committee on Public Works.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

A statement prepared by him regarding the fifteenth anniversary of the Public Affairs Committee.

By Mr. WILEY:

An article entitled "Preparedness," written by him and published in the May 1951 issue of the magazine the Reserve Officer, referring to a long-range program for American preparedness.

By Mr. LODGE:

An editorial entitled "A Critical Situation," written by Charles A. Parker and published in the Civil Air Patrol News of April 23, 1951.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

An article entitled "Ships Aiding Russia Mortgaged to United States," written by Helen Delich, and published in the Baltimore Sun of April 29, 1951.

By Mr. ECTON:

An editorial entitled "City Folks and Meat Prices," published in the Bozeman (Mont.) Daily Chronicle of April 27, 1951.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Letter regarding instruction of young people in better citizenship, written by Charles Kress, of Binghamton, N. Y.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

An editorial entitled "Why Does Labor Act That Way?" written by Edwin A. Leahy, and published in the April issue of Extension magazine.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF POLAND'S DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTION (MAY 3, 1791)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I had intended to read into the RECORD a very brief statement, but in view of the fact that I must return to the hearing, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a brief statement by me on the occasion of the anniversary of the enactment of Poland's democratic constitution on May 3, 1791.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF POLAND'S DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTION (MAY 3, 1791)

On this anniversary of the enactment of Poland's democratic and progressive constitution (May 3, 1791), it is a privilege indeed for me to add my voice to the many who are expressing warm-hearted recognition to

Poland's splendid contribution to western Christian civilization.

Today, despite that magnificent record, Poland lies behind the iron curtain and those citizens of Poland behind that curtain and their friends and countrymen on this side of the water look to America as among those free nations who have not forgotten Poland's fate and the history of freedom she represents. We in Massachusetts number proudly among our citizens 53,000 men and women who were born in Poland and many others of direct Polish descent. We know at first hand what Poland and what freedom mean to them.

On this anniversary let us all, as Americans, remember the obligation and the opportunity that are ours—the opportunity and obligation of standing for the right of free men and women to remain free and to enjoy that life and liberty and chance for the pursuit of happiness that have since 1776 been the bond which has held us all together. It is those same ideals of freedom to which the Polish people still aspire and for which they long. Let us on this occasion dedicate ourselves to a ceaseless effort to help restore freedom where it has been lost and keep burning brightly the dream of a better day for those upon whom for a time the darkness of tyranny has descended. Let us hope and work and pray that with our help the people of Poland may again enjoy all those blessings of liberty to which they are so fully entitled.

WORLD MOVEMENT FOR WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—DISCOURSE BY HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS XII AND ARTICLE FROM AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few weeks ago a very significant event occurred in the area of international relations in world politics, when His Holiness Pope Pius XII issued a statement to the delegates to the Fourth Congress of the World Movement for World Federal Government on April 6, 1951. In view of the importance of this statement, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point. I also ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Pope be followed by an article entitled "Pope Pius XII and World Federation" and written by Father Edward E. Conway, appearing in the April 28, 1951, issue of America.

There being no objection, the discourse by the Pope and the article from America were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF DISCOURSE BY HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS XII DURING AN AUDIENCE WITH DELEGATES TO THE FOURTH CONGRESS OF THE WORLD MOVEMENT FOR WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, APRIL 6, 1951

We are very appreciative of the deference you have displayed by this visit and we take pleasure in addressing you members of the World Movement for World Federal Government. We give you cordial greetings of welcome. Our lively interest in the cause of peace in the midst of a humanity so grievously tormented is well known to you. We have given frequent proof of this interest. That interest, moreover, is inherent in our mission. The maintenance or the reestablishment of peace has always been and always and increasingly will be the object of our constant solicitude. And if, too often, the results have been far from equal to our efforts and our acts, lack of success will never discourage us, so long as peace does not reign in the world. Faithful to the spirit of Christ, the church is striving and working for it with all her strength; she does this by her precepts and her ex-

hortations, by her incessant activities and by her ceaseless prayers.

The church is indeed a power for peace, at least wherever are respected and appreciated at their true value the independence and the mission which the church holds from God, in those areas where no one seeks to make her the docile servant of a political egoism, and where she is not treated as an enemy. The church longs for peace, she strives incessantly for peace, and her heart is ever with those who, like her, desire peace and devote themselves to it. She knows also, and this is her duty, how to distinguish between the true and the false friends of peace.

The church desires peace, and therefore applies herself to the promotion of everything which, within the framework of the divine order, both natural and supernatural, contributes to the assurance of peace. Your movement, gentlemen, dedicates itself to realizing an effective political organization of the world. Nothing is more in conformity with the traditional doctrine of the church, nor better adapted to her teaching concerning legitimate and illegitimate war, especially in the present circumstances. It is necessary, therefore, to arrive at an organization of this kind, if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race in which, for decades past, the peoples have been ruining themselves and draining their resources to no effect. You are of the opinion that this world political organization, in order to be effective, must be federal in form. If by this you understand that it should not be enmeshed in a mechanical unitarism, again you are in harmony with the principles of social and political life so firmly founded and sustained by the church. Indeed, no organization of the world could live if it were not harmonized with the whole complex of natural relations, with that normal organic order which rules the particular relations between men and men and between different peoples. If it does not do that, then, no matter what its structure may be, it will not be able to stand up and endure.

For this reason we are convinced that your first concern should be to establish solidly or to restore these fundamental principles in every field: national and constitutional; economic and social; cultural and moral:

In the national and constitutional fields: At the present time the life of nations is everywhere disintegrated by the blind worship of numerical strength. The citizen is the voter. But, as such, he is in reality nothing but one of the units, the total of which constitutes a majority or a minority, which the shifting of a few votes or even of a single one would suffice to reverse. As far as parties are concerned, he is of importance only for his voting value. No concern is shown for his position and part in his family and his profession.

In the economic and social fields: There is no organic and natural unity amongst producers; a condition that has obtained ever since quantitative utilitarianism, the sole consideration in the matter of net cost, became the one norm determining both the location of production and the distribution of labor, and since the idea of class, which artificially divides men in society, replaced the idea of cooperation within the professional community.

In the cultural and moral fields: Individual liberty, freed from all bonds and all laws, all objective and social values, is in reality only a death-dealing anarchy, especially in the education of the young.

Unless the universal political organization rests upon these indispensable foundations, there is risk of its being infected with the deadly germs of mechanical unitarism. We would like to invite those to reflect on this point, precisely from the federalist viewpoint, who dream of setting up a world parliament. Otherwise they would subject

themselves to the play of those disintegrating forces from which our political and social order has already suffered too much. They would only finish by adding one more legal automaton to the many others which threaten to stifle the nations and to reduce men to the condition of inert instruments.

Just as, therefore, if it is to be true to the spirit of federalism, the future world political organization cannot under any pretext allow itself to be caught up in the play of mechanical unitarism, so also it will enjoy effective authority only insofar as it safeguards and encourages everywhere the life that is proper to a healthy human community, to a society in which all the members cooperate together for the good of the whole humanity.

What a fund of moral steadfastness, intelligent foresight and capacity for adjustment this world authority will have to possess, qualities more than ever necessary in those critical moments when, in the face of malevolence, people of good will must resort to its authority. After all the proofs—trials—of the past and present, would anyone dare to say that the current resources of government and politics are adequate? In truth, it is impossible to solve the problem of a world political organization without being willing to leave the beaten path from time to time, without appealing to the witness of history, to a sane social philosophy, and even to a certain divining of the creative imagination.

There, gentlemen, is a vast field of work, study and action. You have understood this and looked it squarely in the face. You have the courage to spend yourselves for this cause. We congratulate you. We express to you our wishes for your good success, and with all our heart we pray God to grant you His light and help in the performance of your task.

[From America of April 28, 1951]

PIUS XII AND WORLD FEDERATION

(By Edward A. Conway, S. J.)

The more I study the April 6 discourse of the Holy Father, in which he gave his approbation to the World Federalist movement, the warmer grows my sense of satisfaction. As I write, I have before me the text of his address in French and two unofficial English translations, neither of which can be considered definitive. I hope that we shall soon have an authorized English version, because the discourse, being the first formal papal pronouncement on world government, has profound significance for all students of world affairs. Scholars will be analyzing and interpreting it for months to come. They should have the authentic thought of the Holy Father to work on.

The original text richly repays detailed study. At the very first reading it was obvious to me that there was more than just another extempore greeting to a group of pilgrims. I thought, as I read, that the Holy Father must have worked over that address as carefully as he did over any of his famed Christmas allocutions. I have since been told that His Holiness confided to one of his auditors afterward that he had stayed up late the night before to complete the text of his discourse, and that previously he had spent many hours in consultation about it. It seems obvious that the Holy Father had determined to make a major-policy pronouncement, and just as obvious that he had determined to use the World Federalist Congress as the occasion for it.

Some of the satisfaction that warms me comes, I confess, from personal considerations. I have been hard pressed at times to defend my presence (with a Catholic bishop) on the National Advisory Board of United World Federalists, Inc. UWF is the largest membership group among the 70 constituent organizations in 27 countries which make up

the World Movement for World Federal Government. The unfortunate and, for me, embarrassing fact is that many American Catholics have been turned against world federalism, and specifically against United World Federalists, by the absurd charge that the entire federalist movement is a Communist conspiracy. Almost daily during the past 3 years I have received letters from Catholics—some inquiring, some indignant—about my part in the federalist movement. It would have been much easier for me to answer them if the Holy Father had ever made a clear-cut and quotable statement dealing directly with world federal government. Unfortunately for me and other Catholic federalists, up to April 6, 1951, he had not.

It was always possible, of course, to prove that a Catholic could be a Catholic and a federalist. But it was necessary to string together texts from the Pope's Christmas allocutions—a hint here and a hint there—sufficient, however, to prove to the unprejudiced that "the new world order" desired by the Pope was actually some form of world federal government. But it was an unsatisfactory business at best, complicated and prohibitively time consuming.

I tried another tack some time ago by arguing not from textual but from circumstantial evidence. On November 11, 1948, the Holy Father had addressed 300 members of the European Union of Federalists at Castel Gandolfo. EUF is a federation of European federalist groups, and is closely allied with the World Movement for World Federal Government. The Holy Father told the European federalists that it was "high time" to establish a European union. "Some," he added, "are even asking themselves whether it is not already too late."

My World Federalist friends, I reported, were much encouraged by the Holy Father's partial support:

"Even though the Holy Father, they reason, said nothing explicitly about world federation, his warm approval of European federation will surely give immense impetus to their movement and hasten thereby the larger development they desire."

I added—naïvely, I know now—that I was inclined to agree with my World Federalist friends. My article ended with the observation:

"American Catholics could make a distinctively Catholic and definitely valuable contribution to the World Federalist movement. It remains to be seen whether the Pope's Armistice Day address will inspire them to do so. At the very least we may expect the more perceptive among them to begin taking an interest in federalism, since it so obviously interests the Pope."

Earlier in the article I had warned the federalists that "Catholics are curiously and often callously indifferent to noninfallible papal pronouncements." But I was totally unprepared for and correspondingly appalled by what followed. Most of "the more perceptive Catholics" remained indifferent to federalism, while the less perceptive began to take what I must call a violent interest in the destruction of the whole movement.

Catholic newspapers reprinted the misrepresentations of Mervin K. Hart's rabidly nationalistic Economic Council Letter, and quoted approvingly from Joseph P. Kamp's *We Must Abolish the United States*, which asserts that the aims and objectives of the American Federalists add up to treason. Indeed, treasonous, traitorous, and unpatriotic were among the milder epithets hurled at Catholic Federalists by fellow-Catholics. For a time we dismissed these denunciations as being merely what Pius XII called in 1948 the aberrations of an intransigent nationalism which denies or spurns the common bonds linking the nations together.

It was not long, however, before similar attacks came from more responsible Catholic quarters, based only too obviously on the

same poisonous sources. Moreover, authorized representatives of respectable Catholic organizations began to appear before State legislatures demanding the repeal of long-standing world-government resolutions. Thanks to this Catholic intervention, some legislatures either repealed or modified them.

United World Federalists, chief beneficiary of this Catholic interest in federalism, and much disturbed by it, asked its most prominent Catholic member to do something about it. He is Thomas H. Mahony, Boston attorney, former president of the Catholic Association for International Peace, now chairman of the Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs, and for 3 years chairman of the UWF policy committee. Mr. Mahony tried to lift the level of the debate by compiling *Parallel Thinking, Catholic and Federalist, Upon the Organization of the World Peace*. Under five headings: Disarmament; Security and Preparedness; National Sovereignty and its Limitation; Amendments of the United Nations Charter; A Federated World, he compared Catholic statements from St. Augustine to Pius XII with corresponding UWF proposals. Eschewing all argument, Mr. Mahony simply asked his readers to draw their own reasonable inferences from the comparison. The similarities were sensational.

The booklet was published last September (15 cents, Thomas H. Mahony, 10 State St., Boston 9, Mass.). But it seems to have made little impression in some Catholic communities—Baltimore, for example. Catholic antifederalism reached its apogee there with the appearance of the Baltimore edition of the *Catholic Review* of February 16, 1951. Under a screaming headline, "Catholics Backing Anti-Federalist Move," the diocesan weekly revealed—it must have had its own revelation—that "almost every Catholic in this archdiocese is expressing support of a resolution . . . up before the Maryland House of Delegates which voices strong objections to the idea of world government as proposed by the Federalists." The Maryland Action Guild, the Knights of Columbus, and the Catholic War Veterans were solidly lined up with the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Daughters of the American Revolution, Children of the American Revolution, the Minute Women of Maryland, and the Daughters of 1812. "The Federalist resolutions," said the Catholic spokesmen, "collided with Catholic patriotic principles." One Louis Carroll, speaking for the Maryland Action Guild, said that World Federalists were most surely moving into the footsteps of Lenin and Stalin (*Catholic Review*, February 23, 1951, p. 3).

Do you wonder that I, as a World Federalist, felt grateful relief and warm satisfaction when I read these words in the Holy Father's April 6 discourse:

"Your movement [the World Movement for a World Federal Government] dedicates itself to realizing an effective political organization of the world. Nothing is more in conformity with the traditional doctrine of the Church, or better adapted to her teaching concerning legitimate or illegitimate war, especially in the present circumstances. It is necessary, therefore, to arrive at an organization of this kind, if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race."

That solemn approbation should end once and for all the argument as to whether a Catholic can be a Federalist. Whether it inspires Catholics to work actively in the Federalist movement remains, as I remarked once before, to be seen. For my part, I cannot recall a more forthright papal endorsement of any movement, either Catholic, or, as this happens to be, nonsectarian.

Some Catholics, of course, are already saying that the Pope approved only the general ideal of a far in the future world state,

not any concrete program for its proximate realization. None but nationalist diehards would deny that he was talking on April 6 to a definite group with a definite, even though not detailed, program. The Pope implied clearly enough, it seems to me, that the world political organization must be realized as rapidly as possible "if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race"—the current race, not one in the problematical future.

The world federal government which WMWFG proposes and which the Holy Father has endorsed is a strictly limited one. During its Roman congress its fourth, by the way, the movement outlined the powers of that government in its "Declaration to the foreign ministers of the four great powers, to all the governments of the nations, and to the world's war-weary peoples":

"The time has come when the nations and peoples of the world must create an all-inclusive world federal government which can guarantee to each nation security against attack by others. Such a government must have the power—

"1. To prohibit by law the right of nations to use force or the threat of force in international affairs.

"2. To make laws binding upon individuals and national governments prohibiting the construction or possession of armaments beyond that required for internal police purposes, and to administer an agreed schedule for universal disarmament.

"3. To maintain adequate and effective civilian inspection and police forces to assure that the world law affecting armaments is respected.

"4. To bring to trial in world courts any individuals and groups who conspire to build weapons of war in violation of world law."

Catholics who fear that a world state possessing those powers would swallow up their personal liberties overlook the world federalist proviso that—

"All powers not expressly delegated to the world federal government should be reserved to the nations and their peoples, thus leaving each nation its choice of its own domestic, political, economic, social, and religious institutions."

In his *Parallel Thinking*, Thomas Mahony made it clear that "the proposals do not envisage a superstate in which nations would be merged and lose their identity and domestic autonomy—a unitary state or empire. They contemplate complete autonomy of each nation in its national or domestic field. They merely propose a limitation of the external authority or sovereignty of nations—the right to make war."

Absolute sovereignty, of course, is the motto emblazoned on the banners of the embattled Catholic opponents of world government. I very much fear that a mistaken notion about sovereignty inspires their charge that world federalism is opposed to Catholic patriotic principles. To put it bluntly, I am afraid that they have never accepted that traditional doctrine of the church with which, according to the Holy Father, the world federalist movement is actually in accord. What is that traditional doctrine? Pius XII forcefully defined it in his Christmas message of 1948:

"The Catholic doctrine on the state and civil society has always been based on the principle that, in keeping with the will of God, the nations form together a community with a common aim and common duties. Even when the proclamation of this principle and its practical consequences gave rise to violent reactions, the church denied her assent to the erroneous concept of an absolutely autonomous sovereignty divested of all social obligations."

Is it too much to hope that the Holy Father's latest interpretation of that principle and its practical consequence—the

ceding to a world government of enough national sovereignty to save the world from catastrophic war—will not give rise to violent reactions? My modest hope is that it will inspire all American Catholics to study this remarkable document. Every one of its paragraphs is pregnant with meaning. Almost every one of its lines reminds one of more extended treatment of the same topic in other papal pronouncements.

I hope, too, that the Holy Father's discourse will arouse new interest in Guido Gonella's *A World To Reconstruct*. Cardinal Stritch's bishops' committee on the Pope's peace plan published it in 1944 through Bruce of Milwaukee. My esteemed associate, Father LaFarge, predicted at the time (America, September 5, 1944) that the book would produce "wide enlightenment." Would that it had. Signor Gonella, most authoritative interpreter of the mind of Pius XII on the problem of world order, may still be, in Father LaFarge's phrase, "strong medicine." But I question whether, in view of the Pope's recent pronouncement, he still is "much stronger medicine than most people in this country and most of our politicians are prepared to swallow." Is it too much to ask that a revised version of Gonella be published promptly?

In view of the widespread misapprehension that all World Federalists are Communist conspirators, it is unfortunate that in the story on the Pope's April 6 discourse distributed by the NC News Service his concluding remarks were omitted. I add them here to reassure and inspire all Catholic Federalists:

"Therein [solving the problem of a world political organization] lies a vast field of work, study, and action. You have understood this and looked it squarely in the face. You have the courage to spend yourselves for this cause. We congratulate you. We express to your our wishes for your good success, and with all our heart we pray God to grant you His light and His help in the performance of your task."

May thousands of American Catholics soon merit that benediction. May theirs be the mission of helping the World Federalists to skirt the pitfalls which His Holiness warned against in his cordial endorsement of their movement.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

OPEN VERSUS CLOSED HEARINGS AT MEETINGS OF THE ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, since the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee voted this morning to permit Members of the Senate who are not members of the committees to attend the current hearings on national defense policies, which they now have under consideration as a part of their agenda, it is obviously unnecessary for the Senate to take action upon the so-called Watkins-Ferguson resolution, Senate Resolution 137, as originally offered.

However, the junior Senator from Nebraska, speaking, he is sure, on behalf of many Members of the Senate, believes that the question of whether the committees should hold open, public

hearings on matters which do not concern vital security subjects should be determined by the Senate. The Senate should make the final determination.

In order that there may be a clear-cut decision on the question, the junior Senator from Nebraska will move that the Senate do now consider Senate Resolution 137. The resolution is the so-called Watkins-Ferguson resolution.

Mr. President, I will be perfectly frank. If the Senate agrees to my motion, I will move that all after the word "Resolved," referring to the admission of Senators to the hearings, be stricken from the resolution, in view of the fact that such permission has now been granted and to insert in lieu thereof provisions directing open, public hearings, except on matters of vital security, as determined by a majority of the committees.

The junior Senator from Nebraska believes that the American people are entitled to direct, first-hand knowledge of the testimony as given by witnesses before the committees.

The country has heard a part of the story. Why should they not hear the rest of the story? The safe, sure way of getting the facts before the people is to permit the press and radio to report the proceedings directly as they occur and to admit as many people to the hearings as the hearing room will accommodate.

Mr. President, I have just come from the first session of the hearings which convened a short time ago. Never before have I had so many newspaper men rush up to me as when I came out of the door of the committee hearing room. They rushed up to me and asked, "What did he say? What did he say?" In the newspapers this evening, Mr. President, this man will be quoted, and that man will be quoted; this man will give his interpretation, and that man will give his interpretation. Either interpretation may be completely different from the intention of the direct testimony. I plead with Members of the Senate to think of what will happen.

I say most respectfully that there is no intention, in asking for hearings to violate any provisions of national security. Men of the caliber of MacArthur, the Secretary of State, and other trusted officials, who will testify before the committees, will not answer any question if the answer involves a violation of the security of the United States. Everyone knows that to be so. The fact has been demonstrated in previous hearings, which were held, for example, on the troops-to-Europe issue, or the so-called Wherry resolution. It has been demonstrated time and time again. Witnesses who were asked such questions, very modestly, humbly, and properly asked that they be permitted to answer such questions in executive session, and that was done. The same procedure could be followed in this case. By and large, the bulk of the testimony should be made public and should be available to the people of the United States.

Policies have been discussed. They have been laid on the table. We should

know whether there is backing for the policies proposed, because the people, through their Congress, are the ones who determine national defense policies. Of course, military questions are left to the military command, as they should be. All questions of national security should be left to them.

I have never had demonstrated to me more clearly than this morning, when I left the hearing room, how the press will try to get every grain of information they can get, to give it to the public. All that can properly be furnished to the public should be furnished to them in the form of direct testimony, reported directly by the press and radio, and only matters of security should be left to the executive session.

As I said, the country has heard a part of the story as it affects the national defense. They should now hear the rest of the story. The safe and sure way of getting the facts before the people is to permit the press and radio to report the proceedings directly as they occur, and to admit as many people to the hearing as the hearing room will accommodate.

Mr. President, I am not asking for a show. I am not asking that the hearings be held in a ball park. I am not asking for a burlesque affair. It was not a burlesque before, and it does not have to be a burlesque now. Under the able chairmanship of one of the finest Members of this body, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is known for his fairness, I will not worry about an open hearing, as he would conduct it, being classified as a burlesque show, or any other kind of show. The hearings will be conducted with respect and dignity. I hope the Senate will take the initiative before it is too late and give the press and the radio an opportunity to report to the public what they can report with respect to the great national defense policies, which the people must help to determine through their representatives in Congress.

It is not unusual to ask for public hearings by the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee. Both committees deal in matters affecting vitally the national security, and both committees are quite able to distinguish between matters which should be kept secret in the public interest and matters which should be made public in the public interest.

Secrecy in Government procedure is abhorrent to the American way. It is not the American way. Foreign policy and national defense policies of this Republic are, in the last analysis, made by the people. I am not complaining about the character or ability of those who constitute the two committees, or about their trustworthiness. But all the Members of the Senate and House who are duly elected by the people are the ones to form the defense policies of the country. In the United States the people rule; and if the people are to make the right decisions, they must have all the necessary facts to do so.

I say to Members of the Senate, including my good friend the majority leader—and I say this from the bottom of my heart—that it is only in this spirit and

with this approach that the junior Senator from Nebraska now moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137, which is the so-called Watkins-Ferguson resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 137) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That any Member of the Senate is authorized to attend as an observer any hearing or other meeting, whether executive or open, held by the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations in accordance with the order of the Senate of April 25, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I intend to offer, which was to be printed and lie on the table—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate must first proceed to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. I am merely asking that the amendment which I propose to offer be read at this time, if the present occupant of the Chair will permit it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no disposition to prevent it.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that it be read at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Nebraska will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert the following:

That the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly to consider matters affecting the national defense, be, and hereby are, directed to hear General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and other witnesses in open, public hearings: *Provided*, That no matters, the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open, public hearings.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I may continue for a moment, I neglected to state, as I should have stated, that if my motion is agreed to, it will only temporarily displace the unfinished business. This is the only way such a motion can be made. My understanding is that if the motion is agreed to, when the resolution is disposed of the unfinished business will be the farm-labor bill, or it could be made the unfinished business on motion of the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In view of the Senator's remarks, the Chair suggests that the adoption of the resolution would displace the unfinished business and send it back to the calendar. Another motion would be necessary to take it up again. It would not be merely temporarily displaced.

Mr. WHERRY. If that be the case, not only will the junior Senator from Nebraska support a motion to make the farm-labor bill the unfinished business, but I am satisfied that I speak for many

Members on this side of the aisle when I say that they will support it. There is no intention to cause any undue delay in the passage of the farm-labor bill. The demonstration made on the floor of the Senate by many Senators who are in favor of it, including the Senator from Nebraska, certainly is evidence of that fact.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. What will happen to all the amendments to the pending bill which have already been adopted by the Senate if the bill is sent back to the calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments which have been agreed to would not be affected.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the status of the bill would remain as it now is, so far as the amendments which have already been adopted are concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct; and the amendment pending would be pending when the consideration of the bill was resumed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we have been engaged in consideration of the farm-labor bill for an entire week. This is the eighth day since its consideration was started. We have been deprived of an opportunity to pass the bill largely by speeches on the MacArthur controversy. I do not know how the Senate is going to transact any business if that sort of thing continues.

I take the position that, regardless of what my personal ideas may be, the committees should be permitted to pass upon their own procedures, and decide whether they are to have open hearings or closed hearings. It would certainly be an unusual procedure for us again to put on a show before the public.

The Senator from Nebraska has stated that General MacArthur came before the joint meeting of the Senate and House and discussed certain matters. I presume he told everything that he wanted to tell in open hearings. I presume that at that time he told the things which he thought the public ought to know. The main thing which I want the people to have the benefit of, to as great an extent as possible, is the documentary evidence. However, a part of that is highly secret. A request has been made for the plans of the fighting in Korea. I would be willing to concede, at least for the sake of argument, that General MacArthur would not reveal any secret, but once a question is asked in regard to a secret document, that secret document becomes evidence. Everyone knows that in the trial of cases in court questions are frequently asked for their effect upon the jury.

Mr. President, before passing on the question of taking up the resolution and displacing the farm-labor bill, I feel that we should have a quorum call, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I withhold it for the moment.

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY TO VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AIKEN submitted the following conference report, which was read:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vermont, for agricultural purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the Vermont Agricultural College, a State-owned corporation, upon acceptance by said agricultural college, without cost, the real property comprising nine hundred forty-two and forty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, of the United States Morgan Horse Farm located in Addison County, town of Weybridge, Vermont, and such of the personal property of this station as may be agreed upon, in writing, by the Secretary of Agriculture and the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College. Such real and personal property and research records shall be transferred upon the express condition that they shall be used by the Vermont Agricultural College for the benefit of agriculture for such period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the said college at the time of transfer.

"The authority herein contained shall expire on June 30, 1951, unless, prior to such expiration date, the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College shall have notified the Secretary of Agriculture of the acceptance of the lands and other property of the station under the terms of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the conference report on Senate bill 271 has been approved by the House. That is the bill relating to permission to the Department of Agriculture to transfer the so-called Morgan horse farm at Weybridge, Vt., to the Vermont Agricultural College under certain conditions. I understand that the conference report was approved by the House today. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Does not the Senator from Vermont think that the Sen-

ator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] ought to have notice that the conference report is being taken up?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether the Senator from Oregon wants notice of it or not.

Mr. MCFARLAND. This is a privileged matter, and it can be taken up immediately after the quorum call. I think we ought to have a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hayden	Murray
Anderson	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Kilgore	Robertson
Carlson	Langer	Schoeppel
Cordon	McFarland	Wherry
Dirksen	McKellar	Williams
Eaton	Martin	
Ellender	Maybank	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. HENNING, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will act accordingly.

Mr. NEELY. I ask unanimous consent that the motion be repeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion has been agreed to, that the Sergeant

at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. No debate is in order. There is no quorum present.

Mr. NEELY. I ask unanimous consent to amend the request so that it will be in conformity with the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot consider a unanimous-consent request when there is no quorum present, and it has been so announced.

After a little delay, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KEM, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONROE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THYE, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in order to make effective the provisions of the bill it will be necessary to obtain an appropriation from the Vermont Legislature. The legislature will adjourn next week. Therefore, in order that the President may be able to sign the bill before it is too late, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana to lay on the table the motion to reconsider made by the Senator from Vermont.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make very brief comment. I merely desire to say that everything I said in the past in opposition to the bill I now say again by way of reference, and theoretically incorporate as a part of my remarks. I recognize that the Senate has spoken. Nevertheless, I think time will prove that the observations I made in opposition to the bill were right.

OPEN VERSUS CLOSED HEARINGS AT MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear with reference to the pending motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think it would be setting a very poor precedent if the Senate were to adopt special rules directing committees how they shall hold their hearings every time a hearing is held. I think such matters should be left for determination to the committees themselves. I believe the Senate would regret it in the future if it agreed to the pending motion.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska has made the statement that he is certain the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would be able to conduct hearings which would not be a show and would not reveal any secrets. I am glad that he has confidence in the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I hope that he will have sufficient confidence in him to follow his good judgment in regard to what ought to be done with reference to the resolution directing that the committees shall have open hearings, which would be contrary to the majority judgment of the committees.

I have at all times stated, and I am still of the opinion, that every bit of evidence which can be divulged without risk to the security of the United States and without risk to the lives of our boys in Korea should be given to the public. Such has been my position from the very beginning. I think the Senate of the United States is not in the position of making such a determination. The Senate as a whole should not make the decision. The members of the committee know more about the contents of secret documents. Therefore, so far as I am personally concerned, although, as I have said from the very beginning, I am in favor of the public having the benefit of every bit of information which does not risk the security of the United States of America. I believe the question should be left to the committees. As I said, it would be a poor policy to establish a precedent of this kind.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution before the Senate is not for consideration. The question is on the motion to take it up.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan, as one of the sponsors of the resolution, wishes to thank the committee, particularly the chairman, for having voted in committee today to permit all Senators to be present at the hearings. I believe at times this morning more Senators who are not members of the committee were present at the hearing than the 25 members who constitute the committee. It showed the great interest felt by Senators. I am satisfied that the testimony convinced every Senator that the problem involved is of great concern to the Nation. I suppose there will be differences of opinion as to whether or not any word was said of a nature which should not be given to the general public.

Mr. President, the sons of our citizens are dying on the battlefields of Ko-

rea. At the hearing this morning appeared the Commander in Chief in that area, who was there with the boys. He personally went to the front on many occasions. He testified this morning.

The Senator from Michigan has not taken the floor on the merits of the controversy, but merely on the procedure to be followed. The Senator from Michigan spoke briefly yesterday on the necessity for allowing the Senators to hear the testimony. I also said that I was in favor of holding public hearings. I hope that the hearings will be open. I should like to be corrected if I am wrong, but I understand that no vote was taken by the committee this morning on the question of holding open hearings. I again wish to thank the members of the committee for what they have done today for the United States Senate and for the people of the United States, by allowing Senators to attend the hearings. At first glance the resolution which it is sought to have considered may seem to be moot; but it is not moot.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. Did the committee vote this morning to permit only Senators to attend the hearings, or did the committee vote to permit also Members of the House to attend?

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that only Senators were permitted. If I am wrong, I should like to be corrected. The Senator from Michigan was not present when the vote was taken.

Mr. President, this is not a moot question. The only way we can get the question parliamentarily before the Senate is by a consideration of the resolution. It is the intention of the Senator from Michigan, in behalf of himself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] to modify the resolution, so as to include the language of the amendment which is now on the desk. I should like to point out to the Senate exactly what we would be voting on. The modification provides:

That the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly to consider matters affecting the national defense, be, and hereby are, directed to hear General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and other witnesses in open, public hearings—

This is the important part of the language—

Provided, That no matters, the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open, public hearings.

Mr. President, they can hold executive hearings on all matters which are secret, or which should be considered in secret because they involve the security of the United States. That is the only question. There is no excuse for a private hearing on anything except matters which would affect the security of the United States. This is an investigation of a question of policy.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Just a moment. I agree that if any question involves the security of the United States, it should

be considered in secret. We have lost too many men, and we do not want to lose more by virtue of making public any information which involves the national security.

I hope we can get a vote on this question, and have an assurance from the chairman of the committee that he will call his committee together and place this proposal before them, so that they may do as they did this morning, namely, reverse their ruling and allow hearings under the terms of the modified form of the resolution, depending upon the security of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to say, Does the Senator from Michigan know whether or not anything will come out at the hearing which may be in the nature of a military secret?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan does not know what the committee has in mind bringing out. The Senator from Michigan can only say what he heard this morning. The Senator from Michigan will say at this moment that he did not hear anything which he believes would affect the security of the United States. It might benefit, but I do not think it would be detrimental to the security of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask a further question. Does the Senator believe that the 26 Members of the Senate who are members of the joint committee, and will be listening to all the evidence brought out, would be more competent to pass upon the question when it arises in the committee than the Senate as a whole would be? Which group would be more competent?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is not the question before the Senate today. It is proposed to give to the committee authority to pass upon the question of security.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is that after the question has been asked and answered, or before?

Mr. FERGUSON. It will be at the time the question is asked. This problem has been solved in Appropriations Committee hearings and in hearings before other committees. Practically all the witnesses will be military men. If they are not military men they will not know any military secrets.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. FERGUSON. Just a moment. They will be able to say whether or not a certain question is prejudicial to the security of the United States.

This procedure has been followed by committees during the entire life of the Senate. During World War I and World War II committees held public hearings. Military witnesses are very careful. They are not going to say anything which is prejudicial. Questions which involve the

security of the United States can be answered in a secret session.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does not the Senator know that while various and sundry questions are being asked at a public hearing, with the public listening in, Stalin will have his stool pigeon there, and that when questions are asked and answered Stalin will immediately know what benefits Russia. Is that not true?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the same procedure would apply to these hearings that applies to all other open hearings. I take it for granted that representatives of Tass and other persons who are interested in Russia would be present. Even in the departments there are persons who have been known to give evidence to Russia. Even in the Justice Department, when the FBI reports came through, minutes were taken from them and delivered to Russia. Even in the Defense Department there were persons who mimeographed reports of secret documents.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Just a moment. The evidence clearly shows that there was a microfilming machine in Georgetown, where the agents of a foreign government were making microfilms of documents when they were not able to carry packages of them to New York, in order that they might be given to the secret agents of Russia.

We are talking about the public in this great Republic, where public opinion must be a force, and yet it is said that the public is not entitled to open hearings.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it is not a transgression of the rules of the Senate to inquire about procedure in the other body, am I correctly informed that the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House announced yesterday that they propose to have open hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives? If they do, will it not make the Senate seem positively silly?

Mr. FERGUSON. I saw what the Senator has indicated in the press, and I take it to be a fact.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator has described some tragic events where great effort was evidently made to obtain some of the secret information with reference to the security of this country. Is the Senator not aware that what he here and now proposes would make it possible for the information to reach the enemy without his having to go to so much trouble? I wonder if he is seeking to make it easier for him.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator knows that what he says is an absolute falsehood. He knows it. There is no doubt

about it. He accuses the Senator from Michigan of wanting to give aid and comfort to an enemy, Mr. President.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President—

Mr. FERGUSON. I will not yield, Mr. President.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wish to say this—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I decline to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators will respect the desire of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not going to say any more to the Senator from Oklahoma, except to tell him this: I am reminded of the farmer who was kicked by a mule. His friends said, "What did you do to the mule?" He replied, "I considered the source." I now consider the source from which that remark came, and I have no further reply to it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan was sincere when he requested yesterday that Members of the Senate be permitted to be present at the hearings. One of the first men to appear there was a man who filibustered on this floor last night, using ridicule because he did not have anything to say. He was the first to go into the hearing and sit there. Oh, if the public could have seen his face when the testimony was being given at the hearing, he would have been able to convey to Oklahoma some of the real facts. I am sure that when he lies down in bed he will remember some of the things he said upon the floor of the Senate, ridiculing the general who testified. God gives man a conscience, so that he can repent for wrongs.

Mr. President, I was sincere when I made my request yesterday, and I am sincere today. I yield to no man in patriotism or in the desire to defend America. I know what communism is. I have studied it. The Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Michigan took affirmative action when they proposed the security bill, which other Senators joined them in passing, but which was opposed by some Members of the Senate. That bill was passed in the Senate and in the House over the President's veto.

Yet, it is said that we on this side who want open hearings are traitors to the United States of America!

Mr. President, I never thought the time would come when men's consciences would leave them, and for political benefits they would say things upon this floor in accusation of other Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not rise with any hope that any appeal to reason in this body in the prevailing atmosphere could possibly have any effect. I regretfully express the opinion that the Senate has passed the boundary of reason in these matters. I rise in justice to myself to speak on a question about which I have profound convictions, and in order that the record for the future may be quite clear.

May I be permitted to advert briefly to the question of Senators attending this hearing? I have had certain difficulties in arranging the hearings and in attempting to follow my policy of consulting with all the members of the committee with respect to the details. I encountered a difficulty when the Armed Services Committee in the first instance, as I understood, voted unanimously to conduct the hearings in executive session. Public sentiment was at fever heat after that action was taken.

I do not challenge the right of any person to reverse himself, and I am not undertaking to apply the doctrine of estoppel to any Senator. A Senator has a right to change his views at any time he sees fit. I merely point out some of the difficulties which a Senator who is charged with the responsibility for arranging a hearing on such a highly inflammatory issue encounters.

I went into the meeting of the two committees with a typewritten agenda for the hearings which I desired to submit to the committees. Several of the items were discussed. I reached that point on the agenda where I had written that there was a problem before the committee of determining as to whether or not the committee should accede to the request of Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives that they be permitted to attend the hearings. Before I could proceed with my further suggestion, which is incorporated on that agenda, that as many Members of the Senate be permitted to attend as we could accommodate, discussion broke out in the committee, and by practically unanimous vote it was decided that no Members of the Senate or of the House of Representatives should be admitted. I do not relate these facts as an attempt to apply the doctrine of estoppel to Members of the Senate who desire with the acuity of an acrobat in the arena to change their minds. That is fully within their rights. I cite it merely to show the difficulties I have encountered and the state of mind of Senators in the existing hysteria.

Pursuant to the instructions of the committee I told Members of the Senate who were among my best friends that they could not be admitted to the hearings, and I did it under the impression that I was supporting the committee. The committee promptly failed, or many of them, to support me.

This morning I called the committee together before the time for the hearing of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, and suggested to them that the committee change its place of meeting to the caucus room in the Senate Office Building in order that all Members of the Senate might be admitted. I state that, Mr. President, merely for the Record, not with any attempt to please any person, not in any attempt to curry favor with any Senator or any other person, but in justice to myself.

Mr. President, though I usually value the good will and the high opinion of my colleagues in this body on both sides of the aisle as much as any man can, I have about reached the stage in these proceedings where I recognize the hopelessness of having anything whatever to

do with respect to my position in connection with these hearings, without giving offense. I always undertake to exercise patience. I was taught in my youth that patience was one of the primary virtues of men. My patience in some matters has been worn a bit threadbare, but that is entirely a personal matter.

Mr. President, there is no question of the right of the Senate of the United States to instruct any committee in this body in any way they see fit. Of course the committee is a servant of the Senate, and the servant cannot be more powerful than the master. I do not challenge the right or the power of the Senate—I do not say the right, for I do doubt the right, but the power of the Senate to instruct a committee of this body to take any action a majority of the Members of this body think should be taken.

I do not challenge the accuracy of the statement so frequently made upon this floor and offered as an excuse by some for reversing their position in various matters, that there is a great clamor on the part of the American people to have these hearings televised and to be put on the radio. Of course it is a fiction to talk about an open hearing if it is to be confined merely to the caucus room in the Senate Office Building. That is a fiction, and it is a political fiction of the worse sort, because few would appear there for the mothers and the fathers of the sons who are fighting in Korea. Precious few of them would be able to get into that room. Members of Senators' families and their best friends would be there; but there would be no room, do not mistake that, for the mothers and fathers of sons who are fighting in Korea. That is the reason given why this unnecessary gamble should be taken, this hazard with those boys' lives who are now fighting in Korea—to permit their parents to attend. It is pure political fiction.

If the Senate sees fit to adopt this extraordinary step of instructing a committee on a matter of this kind, material secrets which would be of assistance to the powers in the Kremlin or those in Peiping would get to those centers of Communist power. That would happen unless the American people are denied this entertainment of a televised hearing. Which is more desirable?

I do not doubt either, Mr. President, that a great deal of political capital can be made out of the positions of Senators with respect to this issue. Where public sentiment is in full swing, and where public clamor is most strident, there is the opportunity for political capital. And it is here in this issue.

Mr. President, I have been disturbed in recent days, and been concerned as I have never been before in my life because of the way Senators take position on affairs of Government, by taking action in response to a quick expression of uninformed desire, when the facts at issue have not been placed before all the people from whom the clamor comes. I believe, Mr. President, that there is an issue in this controversy that has survival considerations more important than are the considerations of our tenure of office and our salaries, which depend

upon the length of our stay in this body. There is something here that is more important than the election of the President of the United States in 1952. That is the question of national security, of the lives of American boys. For my part I think that these times are very opportune for Senators who wish to demonstrate the courage of rising above the expedient thing of the moment, of doing that which is right, that which will serve their country. Let the political consequences take care of themselves and do that which is right.

Mr. President, we started these hearings this morning. Of course, we have not proceeded at any great length with them. I think they have been conducted—if I may be pardoned for giving expression to such a statement, in view of the fact that I am chairman of the committee—in an orderly manner. I think there has been a semblance of dignity in the committee room. We have not had the klieg lights; we have not had the radio; but I daresay that more progress was made in the course of the session this morning—delayed as it was and brief as it was—in getting at what should be our objective, namely, the truth and the facts, than would have been made with 4 or 5 days of hearings in a circus atmosphere. There can be no question about that. Orderly procedure, expeditious handling, objective search for the truth, protection of the national security, Mr. President, will be best accomplished in an executive session, with all the great care and devotion to detail with which we have gone forward to see that the facts reach the American people promptly and reach them fully, except for those things which would be helpful to the enemy and would be harmful to the American people, and would be paid for by the blood of our very boys in Korea to whom Senators refer in demanding that the hearings be open.

All the people of the United States are represented in these hearings by the Senators who care to attend—Senators who have been duly selected and sworn as the representatives of the people.

Senators talk about having had open hearings of committees all during all the wars. Mr. President, I was in the Senate all during World War II, and I served on the Committee on Appropriations, to which other Senators have referred, and I served on the Committee on Naval Affairs. There was never a single word of testimony—not one—taken on any item affecting the national defense, much less the national security, which was not taken behind closed doors.

Is our country at war today? Are American boys dying today? The political campaign is approaching. During World War II we did not conduct open hearings on such matters. The same glamor, politically, did not attach to the personalities involved and arouse the emotions of the American people as at the moment, but the same basic requirement of protecting the national interest is present today, even as it was in those times. Should that cause us to surrender to political considerations?

Mr. President, I did not hear the remarks of the distinguished Senator from

Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. When reference is made to shows, I must confess that I am almost a two-ring affair today in trying to attend the committee hearings and also endeavoring to be in the Senate Chamber to make a record which I think it is vital to have made. I understand that the Senator from Nebraska said that I would be able to protect the public interest in open hearings.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I said that I attended the hearings this morning, and I spoke in the highest terms of the Senator from Georgia, whom I deeply respect, and who conducted the hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. I said to the Members of the Senate and to the people generally that I knew the Senator from Georgia was so fair and had so much ability that I was sure, regardless of whether the hearings were open or closed, he would conduct them with dignity and with respect, and there would be no burlesque show, and he would conduct the hearings in a fashion which would be a credit to the United States Senate. I mean every word of that, because the Senator from Georgia knows the high regard I have for him and my feelings toward him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's remarks very much, and his high regard for me is one of my cherished possessions. I had not correctly understood what he had said. As I walked on to the floor of the Senate the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] was speaking, and I understood him to say that the Senator from Nebraska had said that I would be able, as chairman of the committee, to protect security matters.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct, but I said I felt sure there would be no burlesque show and it would not be like a ballpark performance, because I knew that the Senator from Georgia had the ability to protect the hearings, even if they were open, so that they would be conducted in a dignified and orderly fashion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's statement. However, my understanding of his statement was that he said I would be in a position to conduct the hearings in such a way as to protect the public interest and avoid disclosure of damaging plans.

Mr. WHERRY. I said the Senator from Georgia had the ability to protect the meetings so that there would be no burlesque show or no resemblance to a meeting in a ballpark, but that the hearings would be conducted with the dignity and the ability which always characterize the activities of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall yield in a moment, but first let me make one statement.

Dignity—which I have never sought to assume—and ability—of which I have never boasted, but which are attributed to me by the distinguished Senator—and

I appreciate the attribution—are a very poor substitute for security and for saving the lives of American boys.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is one of the points I raised, namely, that because of the ability and knowledge the Senator from Georgia has of military affairs, I was positive there would be no violation of the national security as a result of the questions which were asked and answered in the hearings. I am as sure as I am sure that I am standing here now, that because of the ability of the Senator from Georgia, not a question would be answered which would in any way violate the national security. I have so much faith in the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I am entirely sure of that.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what I understood the Senator from Arizona to say in referring to the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska, and that is why I remained on the floor to make this statement, because I refuse to have this responsibility even impliedly saddled upon me by the words of any Senator. Mr. President, I have never shirked any responsibility that it was possible for me to discharge. I do not do so now, but I refuse to accept any such responsibility even if the Senate by a majority vote should seek to impose it upon me. No patriotic man who feels as I do about the importance of protecting the critical secrets of this Nation in this dark hour would assume any such obligation if he knew the nature of the documents and the evidence involved in this hearing. I am here to express by my vote my protest against any action of the Senate which would place any such fearsome and impossible duty upon any Member of this body. The Senate cannot fix any such responsibility by the words or actions of any other Senator. If the national security is endangered, if future disaster should result, the responsibility rests upon those who vote for open hearings and they cannot be cleared of that responsibility by mere words which seek to fix it elsewhere.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, but I must be brief.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall not take long. First, I wish to say that I completely approve the position—not an easy one—now being taken by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, who is an ornament to the post he holds as chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to address a question to the Senator. Noting that the last clause of the resolution reads as follows:

Provided, That no matters the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open public hearings—

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if it is not true that a majority of such committees has already, upon full deliberation, determined that it

would be prejudicial to the security of the United States for them to proceed in open public hearings in the matter now entrusted to them for hearing?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have only a few minutes more to remain on the floor, because I wish at least to get a sandwich and a cup of coffee before the hearings are resumed.

I shall answer the question by saying that, in my opinion, those words are nothing but window dressing or vote bait. No committee chairman can control questions of members which might endanger the national security, much less the answers which will be given by the witnesses who will be on the stand.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has just come through the hearings on the troops-to-Europe issue. We heard from all the Joint Chiefs of Staff and from various other military men. Questions vital to the security of Europe and questions vital to the security of the United States were asked at those hearings. Therefore, I now ask the Senator this question: Does he not feel that those meetings were conducted in such a fashion that there was no violation of the national security, but that in the end the result was to perform a real service which was of help to the people of the country, in enabling them to understand what was involved in the national defense of Western Europe as well as in the defense of the United States of America?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no more analogy could be drawn between those hearings, involving a question of opinion on a political matter, and the hearings now being held, involving war plans, secret documents, and things of the like, than could be drawn between a donkey and a race horse. There is no comparison whatever.

Mr. WHERRY. A question of national security is certainly involved.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has brought that in again.

Mr. President, I shall ask, because time does not permit me to read it, that I be permitted to place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this juncture the requests which were submitted to me, and which have been submitted by the Republican members of the committee, for secret documents. I challenge and defy the Senator to point to one secret document which was requested or was brought into play in the hearings on the troops-to-Europe question to which he referred. Not a single secret document was requested or brought before the committee in those hearings. In this instance, a veritable mass of the most intimate documents dealing with the defense has been demanded, and I have requested the Department of Defense to supply them. There cannot be any analogy, there cannot be any comparison. I wish I could read all the requests. I cannot do so, but I want the RECORD to show them.

There being no objection, the requests, in the form of a letter dated April 23, 1951, addressed to the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman, Committee on

Armed Services, from the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], also four other letters requesting classified documents and other material were ordered to be placed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 25, 1951.

HON. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: I am enclosing a copy of a letter from Senator BRIDGES to me which I believe is self-explanatory.

In preparation for the MacArthur hearings before the combined Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate, I would appreciate your making available to the committees by Tuesday, May 1, as many of the documents referred to in Senator BRIDGES' letter as can be secured within that time. If you are unable to supply any portion of the material requested, please so inform me.

In addition to the material referred to in items (a) through (f) in Senator BRIDGES' letter I request that you make available to the committees such other documents and information bearing on this same general subject as will assist the committees in their efforts to get a rounded picture of the pertinent factual and documentary data which exist in this field.

In compiling this material the committees request that the security classification of the various documents and items of information be reexamined and downgraded to the maximum extent which you consider consistent with proper security.

I realize that it will not be possible for you or the committees to forecast at this time all of the subjects which may arise during the course of the hearings. As the hearings develop, you may wish to furnish additional compilations and the committees may find it necessary to request additional documents and materials.

In addition to the specific documents referred to above, and the others which I anticipate you will furnish in response to this request, I would like to request that the committees be furnished a copy of such record as may have been made of the Wake Island meeting of last October, which was recently discussed in several newspaper accounts.

I am hopeful that this material can be presented to the committees by a representative of the Department of Defense at an executive meeting to be held Tuesday, May 1. This procedure would assist the committees in understanding the nature of the material submitted and what additional is available.

Sincerely yours,

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
April 23, 1951.

The Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: As the ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee, I suggest that you have the Defense Establishment make available to the committee within the next few days the following documents:

(a) The Wedemeyer Report submitted to the President under date of September 19, 1947. (This report was submitted at the same time as his report on China, which was published in the so-called China white paper in August of 1949.)

(b) A copy of war plans relating to Korea and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff prior to the outbreak of hostilities on June 25, 1950. This document will give the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to what they believed our demands should be in the event aggression took place against the Republic of Korea.

(c) The minutes of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to the strategic importance of Formosa during the 12 months' period, July 1, 1949, through June 30, 1950, together with correspondence and memos between the Department of Defense and the Department of State, dealing with the subject of Formosa during the same period of time.

(d) Directive issued to the members of the United Nations forces in Korea through the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to Republic of Korea officials being restricted from areas north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

(e) Joint Chiefs of Staff document dated on or about January 12, 1951, relative to steps to be taken in regard to the Korean conflict in the event of certain eventualities.

(f) Exact dates subsequent to January 1, 1948, on which Far East headquarters requested additional troops and the number of troops requested in each case. Also dates of the replies from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, showing the number of troops, if any, supplied in conformity with such requests.

(g) Also any other documents that you consider pertinent to the situation.

Sincerely yours,

STYLES BRIDGES.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
April 28, 1951.

HON. RICHARD RUSSELL,
United States Senate.

DEAR DICK: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have written to Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff together with a copy of his reply to me. I believe that this information is different from that requested by you in your letter to Secretary Marshall. However, will you please add to the information requested in your letter to Secretary Marshall the material requested by me in my letter to General Bradley.

I believe that in your letter to Secretary Marshall you requested the notes of the Wake Island conference which were released to the New York Times a short time ago. The information on Wake Island which I have requested deals with a meeting in the Pentagon Building on Wednesday, October 18, 1950, where the correspondents were given background material relative to the Wake Island conference. This meeting was called by Defense Department officials. Secretary Pace did most, if not all, of the "briefing" though General Bradley attended the meeting.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

APRIL 25, 1951.

Gen. OMAR BRADLEY,
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Pentagon Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL: As a member of the Armed Services Committee and in preparation for the hearings that will start next week I would like to receive as soon as possible the following:

1. The build-up of United Nations forces in Korea by months and by nationalities (including United States forces) from July 1, 1950, to April 1, 1951 (or more current figures, if available) for Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Korean theater of operations.
2. The stenographic or other notes made by the Department of the Army or its public-relations staff dealing with the press conference held in the Pentagon Building Wednesday, October 18, 1950, wherein the correspondents were given background material relative to the Wake Island conference.
3. Copy of communication from Gen. Matthew Ridgway to Gen. Lawton Collins or the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to his views on the use of the troops of the Republic of

China as allies in the struggle against Communist aggression in Korea.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1951.
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have your letter requesting the information you would like to have in preparing for the hearings the Armed Services Committee expects to hold next week.

In order that your request may receive early consideration, I have taken the liberty of passing your letter to Secretary Marshall. I am informed that he has received a request from Senator RUSSELL, the chairman of the committee, for similar information. As much of the information being requested deals with the same matters, it would make our task easier and eliminate many duplications if all the requests could be handled through your chairman. I hope this is entirely agreeable to you.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

OMAR BRADLEY.

MAY 1, 1951.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Will you please request of the Senate Appropriations Committee that they furnish the original copy which will show information supplied as a result of the committee's requests and the carbon copy (showing information deleted by the State or Defense Department) of the committee hearings held on Monday, June 26, and on Tuesday, June 27, 1950, at which time Secretary of State Acheson, Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, General Lemnitz, and others from the State and Defense Departments were present and testified relative to military aid in the Far East and elsewhere.

In addition, we also request that the hearings held in executive session on Monday, August 28, 1950, at which time Admiral R. H. Hillenkoetter testified, also be made available to our combined Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. This information is pertinent to the inquiry and I think will give the members of the combined committees information not previously available to them.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

MAY 1, 1951.

HON. RICHARD RUSSELL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Will you please request from the State Department the stenographic notes of the conference held in the State Department on October 6, 7, and 8 of 1949 relating to China and far-eastern policy?

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is one point other than security. Of course, the Senator knows that I have very great regard for his ability, but the difficulty of controlling the secret nature of these matters is, I think, insuperable. But, in addition to that, does not the Senator think that actually getting at the truth of what the nature is of the difference which has arisen, is much more likely to be achieved in executive sessions than in public ses-

sions, aside from the matter of security? Assuming that the Senator is interested, and that the country is interested in getting at the real truth, is it not the Senator's opinion that it is much more likely to achieve that purpose in executive session, because witnesses will be very reluctant to speak about things which are in this field in open session? That is simply human nature. They will not bring themselves to be as frank with the committee as they would if the sessions were closed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there can be no possible question about that. I undertook to emphasize on last Monday that we shall expedite the hearings and reveal the truth if we conduct the hearings in this manner. We can give the American people every fact which can be published without giving aid and comfort to the enemy, whereas, if the hearings are held in such a way that a man must guard every word he utters, if the hearings must be partly in secret and partly in the open, with Senators becoming confused and coming into an open session to ask a question about a secret document which they saw in the closed session, it would obscure the truth, if it did not hide it forever, and risk the lives of American men and the security and safety of the Nation.

So, Mr. President, when I vote upon this question, I wish to make it perfectly clear, so far as I am concerned, that, merely because I am chairman of the committee, I cannot assume responsibility for the protection of the vital interests of the people and of the lives of the sons of American mothers. We have opened the hearings to 96 Senators, representatives of all the people. If we followed the course of permitting the attendance of friends of Senators and the representatives of the press, it would open it up, not only to the representatives of the American people, but to the representatives of Pravda, and the Kremlin. That is the effect of it. It would keep the people from getting the facts and at the same time endanger American lives needlessly.

Mr. President, it might pay political dividends, and there is no question in my mind but that it would, but when it comes to serving the best interests of the country, we would ill serve that interest by open hearings.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the representatives of the Russian press have already asked for a transcript of the hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that is the fact.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. So far as that is concerned, it makes no difference whether the hearings are open or closed, does it? Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, it certainly does make a difference.

Mr. WHERRY. On matters of security, information would be withheld, would it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has the votes, I have been informed. He can take the responsibility of opening the hearings to our enemies. I am not endeavoring to escape any responsibility I should seek to fulfill, but I refuse to accept a responsibility forced upon me in this manner and under these circumstances, and for such reasons. I will not do it, though never in my life have I knowingly avoided any responsibility or duty which could fairly attach to me in any public office I have held, from the time I was a member of the General Assembly of Georgia, down to this good hour.

Mr. President, who is the principal figure in this great drama. The General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. I gave General MacArthur every opportunity, if he thought it well to have the hearings in public session to say so, and to have them held in public session, at least so far as he was concerned. General MacArthur has been in the service of his country for 52 years, and has dealt with security matters for that length of time. He may not have exactly the political interest in this question that others have, because he has disavowed politics, though I think he would be nominated by acclamation if the Republican convention were held any time within the next few months, and he might well be, when it is held next summer. General MacArthur says he disavows politics, I do not think that all of the Republican leaders could stop the stampede. He would be nominated; unless he used Sherman's expression when he was about to have the nomination forced upon him, he would be the Republican nominee—and an able candidate he would be. But General MacArthur certainly has as much at stake in this matter as has any Member of the Senate, and he has much more knowledge of what will affect adversely the lives of the men from whom he was torn in Korea, and of the public welfare and the interests of the United States, than all the men who clamor for an open hearing. I submitted it to him. I said, "If you desire a public hearing, we will have it." He evidently did not desire it. To this moment he has expressed no desire. He realizes the value of security, and he is not a politician in the ordinary sense of the word. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not want to leave the impression, does he, that the distinguished general said he would leave it up to the committees?

Mr. RUSSELL. He made no statement to me about it whatever.

Mr. WHERRY. He has been quoted by a member of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not had time to read the newspapers and to keep up with all those developments.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely ask the Senator the question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have kept in touch with General MacArthur, through correspondence and telegrams, and he has not so expressed himself, though given an opportunity. I do not believe the general would do a committee of the

Congress the discourtesy to tell the newspapers something that he would not tell the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have more regard for him than to think that he would treat a committee of Congress in such manner. I have known General MacArthur for 20 years.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator wish to leave the impression that General MacArthur has refused to testify in public hearings, or that he himself has made a selection or a choice?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator attempts to cut it a little thinner. I gave him the opportunity. I told him that if he desired to have the hearings in open session, we would have open sessions; but General MacArthur, who understands security values, who is a great patriot, who has been in three wars, did not desire to jeopardize the lives of the men whom he left in Korea.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this is the last time I can yield. I am sorry. The hearings are to commence at 2:30, and I have another iron-clad obligation in 15 minutes. I yield this once, and I ask Senators to appreciate the fact that I cannot continue to yield.

Mr. LONG. Unless the Senator from Louisiana got an erroneous impression, the Senator from Georgia today suggested to General MacArthur that if he wanted to have the hearings conducted in open session he could have them in the open, so far as his testimony was concerned. Am I correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think I made that statement to him today. I am not sure that I did. I made the statement at the opening of the hearings, and I may have referred to certain telegrams. I am not sure regarding that, or as to just what I said, but I had in writing given him the opportunity. He is a man who has a vital interest in the issue at stake, for his reputation is involved. There may be Senators who think they can speak for Douglas MacArthur. I have been around these halls for about 18 years, and I have served with many Senators. I have never yet seen a man on this floor who could speak for Douglas MacArthur as Douglas MacArthur can speak for himself. Yet there are a great many people who would speak for him in connection with these hearings.

Mr. President, time forbids that I should proceed much longer. I merely wish by this statement to place the responsibility for any disclosure where the responsibility belongs. We must bear in mind that all the witnesses are not going to be Douglas MacArthur or George Marshall or Omar Bradley or members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. All of them will not know how to protect America's security in the public interest as well as do those men who have spent so many years in the business of protecting the country and the national security.

Mr. President, I repeat, when some persons have shouted about the public interest in open hearings they hope that back of public interest there lies political benefit.

Mr. President, it will be a poor comfort to the mothers and fathers of America whose sons are in Korea to see these hearings on a television set or to hear them on the radio, if as a result of such action they, within a few days, receive a telegram reading, "We regret to inform you that your son has died in action."

Mr. President, I shall vote on this question; I shall leave the session of the committee to do so if the motion is not voted on immediately, because I desire to be on record as voting on this issue.

That vote will cleanse me of the blood of American boys that will be unnecessarily spilled on account of inevitable disclosures. What a poor consolation that will be if I am compelled to see the blood of those American boys on the hands of other Senators. With the perfect conviction that I serve my country's best interests, I shall vote against this motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I strongly support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and the position which has already been taken by a substantial majority of the two committees in expressing their conviction that the hearings, with all their far-flung implications, must, in the protection of the national security, be held in closed session.

Mr. President, in what I shall have to say, there will not be any recriminations, there will not be any charge or the intimation of anything other than patriotism as existing in the heart of any other Senator. But in the very nature of things, I must say that I think the judgment of those who think the hearings should be conducted as open hearings is unwise judgment, unsound judgment, and, besides that, it is judgment which, if it be followed, will make the hearings much longer drawn out. It will not produce a quick development of the facts, secret or otherwise, with reference to many of the separate fields which have to be covered in the inquiry, but it will be a distinct disservice to our people as a whole, and particularly a continuing source of hazard to the security of the approximately quarter of a million American men in Korea who now are fighting for us and for the cause of freemen everywhere.

Mr. President, in a question which I asked of the Senator from Georgia, I have already invited attention to the fact that the last paragraph of the amendment to the resolution lays a predicate for doing the very thing which has already been done by a majority of the two committees, and done, as stated by the Senator from Georgia, and as obviously must have been the case, for the very reason recited in the last paragraph as an adequate reason for keeping the

hearings closed rather than open. The last paragraph reads as follows:

Provided, That no matters, the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open, public hearings.

That ends the quoted part of the resolution.

Mr. President, it is well known to every Senator and, I think, to people generally throughout the United States, that deliberately and after a calm consideration of the whole question, a sizable majority of the two committees, including, it happens, at least one Member who comes from the opposite side of the aisle, has already ruled that, in the judgment of that sizable majority of the two committees, the field to be covered by this investigation necessarily involves matters which could be so prejudicial to the security of the United States, if brought out into the open, that the hearings shall be closed hearings.

If anything more were required to make it appear that the resolution, no matter how well intended, is at most and at best an empty, idle, and vacuous gesture, that fact well appears from the reading of that last paragraph, because it is very clear upon reading it that the Senators offering the resolution do not want to assume the responsibility for untoward incidents which might develop from open hearings upon this grave subject, and which might come in such a way as to jeopardize the security of the United States. Therefore, they have inserted the last paragraph in order to put the responsibility where it belongs, upon a majority of the two committees, and where it has already been exercised by a majority of the two committees—exercised, there can be no doubt in the world, because to permit the hearings to go along in public would present a continued jeopardy to the national security and a continued jeopardy to the welfare and the lives of American boys serving in Korea, as well as the lives of our allies serving there under American command.

Mr. President, let us see what it is that is proposed to be brought out at the hearings. In the first place, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has already placed in the record of the debate a long list of top-secret documents which have been requested by Members of the Senate to be produced in the hearings. Certainly anyone looking at that list knows perfectly well that the secrecy of those documents must be preserved and that the discussion of matters concerning them must remain secret. He knows perfectly well that in a hearing wherein a large number of top-secret documents of this kind become matters for discussion by witnesses, it is extremely unwise and hazardous to leave it to chance questions by various Senators, operating under the very best of motives, as to whether those questions will themselves be prejudicial to the public interest and destructive of public security.

Mr. President, I shall not go into a discussion of incidents in the past.

There have been frequent instances when Senators in good faith have asked questions at hearings which themselves disclosed public secrets of great significance and of great importance. There would be a continuing opportunity and invitation to just that sort of a disclosure and that sort of a situation by having the hearings go on in public, with so many different Senators present, and clothed with authority to ask questions, and having the hearings searched by eyes which certainly might not be friendly, to discover whether questions were asked from time to time in the conduct of the hearings which questions themselves put people who are inimical to us and to our best interests and our best security on notice that there are important secrets in fields which heretofore were, to them, unknown and undisclosed.

Mr. President, what is it that the distinguished General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur, brings to the committee? In the first place, I remind Members of the Senate that before the dramatic appearance of the General of the Army, and as soon as the difficulty arose under which he was relieved by the President of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RUSSELL] stated upon the floor and stated to the press that this was a matter which vitally affected the conduct of the war—regardless of whether we wished to call our Korean engagement by that name—and which required, in his judgment, the presence of the late field commander of our forces in that war to give information to the Committee on Armed Services on the conduct of the war and upon all of its far-flung aspects.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield in a moment.

We know that on one subject which will be explored in great detail, namely, the conduct of the war thus far in Korea, the witness will have to add his comment based on his own peculiar knowledge, of the essential details, which are most closely guarded secrets, with reference to such things as the number and disposition of our forces, the units among our forces, the way in which our forces are armed, the way in which our forces have been behaving so far as their morale is concerned, the kind of naval support which has been given, the force in which our Navy is serving on the two coasts of Korea, the kind of air support which is being given, the number of planes and the variety of planes which have been available, and the attempts which have been made to use, and the use that has been made of, new weapons, some of which have been announced and some of which may not have been announced. In short, all of the intimate details of the conduct of what has certainly grown to be a real war, regardless of what we may call it, is within the knowledge of this distinguished witness.

We know perfectly well that at least one of the purposes of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is to ask that an authoritative report upon all of these matters, and many more affecting the conduct of the

war, shall be made available to the members of the Committee on Armed Services at this particular hearing.

Mr. President, has there been any prior occasion at all when a field commander of a fighting army, which has been fighting under very great difficulties, has come before a committee clothed, as is General MacArthur, with knowledge of such secrets? I may add that the greatness of the difficulties has not been made any clearer by any other source than by the statements of the General of the Army himself.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate should give very careful thought to the fact that the distinguished field commander is here to give a report and to make available to Senators for their official guidance, as members of the committee, and later for the guidance of all Members of the Senate, facts which they will need in determining the many issues which will come before the Senate for solution.

It is ridiculous to make a report of operations of that scope, importance, and secrecy in the goldfish bowl atmosphere which prevails at an open hearing of a committee of the Senate. I cannot understand where the judgment of Members of the Senate has fled when they ask that such information and such a report, basic as they are to any decision to be made upon the whole question, shall be considered except in well-guarded and closed hearings of the Senate committees which are charged with the duty of conducting such hearings.

Mr. President, let us go to other matters which are equally secret: The number, the units, and the disposition of the enemy forces, both North Korean and Red Chinese; the number, disposition, and state of supply of forces of the potential enemy, Russia, across an artificial line only a few miles away, where at least they must be taken into very serious consideration; the number and disposition of Chiang Kai-shek's forces on Formosa, which the general of the Army feels could properly and beneficially be used in the difficulty in Asia, and their morale, state of organization, and arms. Matters of that kind simply cannot be discussed out in the open.

The general of the Army has already made a dramatic public appearance and a dramatic public report at a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress. The Senator from Florida was glad to join in inviting him to make the report. He was glad to applaud him for much of the great work he had done, both as a military man and as a civilian organizer and diplomatic leader in the last 5 years of his important work in Japan.

The Senator from Florida calls attention to the fact that that report was certainly public, and that the numerous reports which have been made since, in other appearances by the general of the Army, have certainly also been public. What we have come down to now is the matter of making available to the Members of the Senate who must make recommendations, and upon which recommendations the Senate itself must finally act, all the intimate facts and all the intimate details concerning our own organization and performance in the war;

and the organization and performance of our enemies, both actual and potential, as well as of our potential friends.

Mr. President, other matters of the greatest importance and secrecy must be gone into at such hearings upon the testimony offered by General MacArthur. One of them has to do with Japan. The general has done a tremendous job in Japan. I am very sure that the committee will want to know what the military potential of Japan is. They will want to know what the feeling of the Japanese people is at this time, both as to their morale and as to their attitude toward us, as well as toward those who fight with us and on our side. They will want to know what the economic situation is in that whole part of the Orient, and as to whether it is in our favor or whether it is adverse to our success.

There are so many facets of the information which must be sought and given at this hearing, Mr. President, that it seems to me that it would be an idle and ridiculous thing to instruct the committee to have open hearings, and end with a paragraph which gives the committee the authority to determine that it shall not go ahead with anything that it regards as prejudicial to the security of the United States, when it has already ruled that it thinks the entire hearings are so enmeshed with secret matters which must not be brought out into the open that a closed hearing is required in order to preserve the secrecy of those many issues, many of which are already known, and many of which are probably unknown to us at this time, and will have to be probed by this particular committee.

There is not the slightest indication or intimation that anyone on either of those committees is trying to hide facts which should come to the Senate. All Members of the Senate were invited to attend, and many were present this morning listening.

Furthermore, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that already the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has released two documents which were regarded as of very great importance, the release of one of which had been long sought by many persons interested in it. I refer to the so-called Wedemeyer report, the release of which has been sought for a period of 2 years or more.

Is it an indication of unwillingness to give information which can be safely given that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has very promptly availed himself of the right to demand the production of this document, and then, having seen that most of it can safely be made available at this late hour, has made it available and turned it over to the public, which has eagerly desired for a long time to see it?

In addition, the Senator from Georgia has also asked for the report on the Wake Island conference between the President of the United States and General MacArthur, and has made that report public and available. It certainly has not been available heretofore.

It ought to be rather apparent that the Senator from Georgia is letting the

chips fall where they may, because a certain group of people were clamoring for one of these reports. The views of that group were supported by the recitals of one of the reports. Another group finds itself supported in part by disclosures in the other report.

The Senator from Georgia has shown with complete fullness that he wants to be fair, and that he is going to make available to the public those things which can safely be made public knowledge, just as quickly as he can determine that fact.

There is one further thing which I think has not been given sufficient emphasis, and that is the apparent unwillingness of those who sponsor this resolution and the position which lies behind it to attribute to the majority members of the joint committee and to the chairman of the joint committee a complete sense of fairness and justice, and also to attribute that quality to the minority members of the joint committee. It is true, of course, that the minority party has almost equal membership on the committee with the majority party. The minority membership of the two committees which have been directed to hold joint hearings consists of most able and distinguished Senators. Let me recite the names of the Senators from the minority side of the aisle who are members of the Committee on Armed Services, and who, if they saw any departure at all on the part of the Senator from Georgia, as chairman of the joint committee, from the path of fairness, justice, and sound Americanism—and I am sure there will be no such departure—would certainly be under obligation of the gravest sort immediately to call attention to any such departure.

Surely the Members of the Senate on the minority side must remember that they have on the Armed Services Committee the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], a former governor of his State; the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], also a former governor of his State—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator—

Mr. HOLLAND. I will not yield until I finish this list.

There is also the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]; the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]; and the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that here are men who have grown gray in the service of their Nation and in the service of their States. Many of them have served in a military capacity in wars which our Nation has fought. I know that one of these men suffered the loss of a dearly loved son in World War II. Surely, Senators on the minority side of the aisle do not find themselves in the situation of being unwilling to rely upon men such as those whose

names I have just read, not only to do the fair thing, but to bring out into the open any departure from rules of fairness, justice, and sound Americanism, if there should be any such departure in the transactions of the joint committee.

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding. I do not want to be disrespectful in any way. The committee is to reconvene at 2:30. Nearly all these arguments have already been brought forward. I wonder if the Senator would not cooperate and permit us to obtain a vote on the pending motion and on the resolution itself. Unless the Senate acts before the committee reconvenes at 2:30, there will be further delay. I do not say that in any sense of disrespect to the Senator or his right to the floor. If he wishes to make the argument, that is all right, but I am saying to the distinguished Senator that the committee is to reconvene at 2:30. I am perfectly willing to forego any answer to anything that has been said, in order to obtain a vote on the resolution. It ought to be done before 2:30 if it is to be done.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator from Florida will not take much more time by his remarks, but he wants to be clearly on record as to how he feels on this matter. He must ask the Senator to indulge him for a few minutes longer.

Let us go to the membership of the Foreign Relations Committee. At the present time there are five distinguished Members of the minority party on that committee. There is a vacancy which can be filled on an hour's notice, and I understand it will be filled immediately. But considering only the five members already upon that committee from the Republican side of the aisle, I call attention to the names of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]; the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], a former governor of his State; the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], a former governor of his State.

I call to the attention of the Senate in general, and particularly to the attention of the minority Members of the Senate, the fact that they have distinguished representation upon the Foreign Relations Committee. Upon that committee are men who have served their States and their Nation ably. Several of them have served in the Armed Forces. Members of the minority can surely rely with complete certainty upon the soundness of service of those men, and upon their willingness to bring to light any departure from the rules of fairness, sound Americanism, and real patriotism, if there are any departures in those respects on the part of the chairman of the committee—of course, there will be none on his part—or on the part of any other members of the committee.

The Senator from Florida will not read the names of the majority members

of the two committees; but among that group are several former governors as well as several men of great distinction from the judiciary—for example, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], former chief justice of the highest court of his State. Incidentally, he too lost a beloved son during World War II.

Mr. President, Senators simply cannot properly take the position of questioning the patriotism of members of the committee, and the soundness of the procedure to be followed by men of such high quality and character. They have already clearly expressed their view, by a majority vote, to the effect that in justice to the country and its most sacred secrets and most carefully guarded measures, measures which are of great importance to our men now serving in Korea, we cannot subject this hearing to open consideration of all these matters and to the possibility of the defeat of our security by bringing in, even unintentionally, matters which point to a situation on which should be carefully concealed and kept away from public knowledge.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is about to conclude. He feels that the Senate has already shown by its action in this matter that it regards this matter as of the gravest importance to the United States because it has assigned this matter jointly for hearing to two of its most distinguished committees, the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, thereby showing that it feels that the subject matters to be gone into by those committees do have a most vital impact upon those matters in our national structure which have to do with national defense and particularly with the conduct of the war now going on in Korea; and they also have to do intimately with the matters of our foreign relations with our allies and with others who are not our allies, and with other nations throughout the earth generally.

Mr. President, that very action shows that the Senate recognizes this matter as being extremely grave and as being of the most vital importance to our Nation in these two great fields.

Mr. President, the question now is whether by the adoption of the proposed resolution the Senate will proceed to place upon the committees the burden of trying to go ahead with open hearings when the committees have already declared that they think that course is unsafe and unsound, and when the committees have already shown by their action that they feel that such a course would not be the safer course, would not be the satisfactory course, would not be the course which gives information most quickly, information which should be given as quickly as possible to our public, and, above all, is not the course which will safeguard the security of our fighting men.

Mr. President, after all, that is the matter of supremest importance. The casualty lists have already struck pretty close to many of us. They have already reached close to the senior Senator from Florida. He knows something about

what is going on in 60,000 homes in the United States, where boys from those homes have either given their all or have suffered wounds, so as to have them named as casualties in the war which is now going on.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I may say to the Senator that as I listened to General MacArthur this morning I got the distinct feeling that the thing that will determine the security of the boys in Korea more than any other one thing is the making of a right decision by the people of America in their choice between the courses of action suggested. The Senator will remember, I am sure, some of the words which I shall not at this time attempt to repeat, but words the Senator will surely remember, of General MacArthur. He was not this morning speaking, so far as I could detect at any point, with the concern of one who is trying to justify a course of action, but as one who was trying to give information and presenting to the Members who were there listening the importance of making a decision that would affect the security of the boys in Korea. Without the information to make that decision properly how can the boys be given security?

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from South Dakota. Perhaps he was not here when the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] made his statement, part of which was that already, since the hearing of this morning, General MacArthur has stated he had to withhold, and felt that it was wise to withhold at a meeting of that kind, facts that are of importance and will have to be given later, but which he feels pertain so vitally to the security of the United States that he could not go into them at that meeting.

The question is this: Shall we go ahead with what does not go beneath the surface, that does not deal with vital questions, shall we skim over everything, and lay aside matters affecting the disposition of our forces, the arming of our forces, the health of our forces, to see that they are supplied with ammunition and other weapons which they can use; the question of the disposition of our naval forces and their numbers engaged, and of our air forces, the question of support which has been accorded to us in this common effort by our allies, who are already in the war, about 20 allies, that is; the question of the organization of those who are our actual enemies, and those who are our potential enemies, and also those who are our potential friends; the question of intimate facts affecting Japan—and we cannot ignore Japan with its eighty or ninety million people who, thanks largely to the service of General MacArthur, are apparently now most friendly disposed to us?

All those matters are so intimate to the whole discussion. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota, that if we carefully evade any reference to them

and carefully evade going into any matter which touches them we have very little left.

It is because of that fact that the two committees have, in their joint judgment, already agreed, by their majority vote, that they do not feel that it is sound to go into this question in open hearing.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I merely wish to ask him, Was it not understood that whatever public hearings might be had, the committees might proceed with executive sessions thereafter, to consider intimate details?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, it was so understood, I will say to the Senator from South Dakota. The very fact that that was the case defers and delays until later hearings getting at the meat in the coconut. And I will say to the Senator that if it is important for the Congress of the United States to take action, if it is important for the Congress of the United States to decide what policy, in its judgment, is best, it must have the facts, and not just that skimming of facts which in the judgment of the committee is safe to be exposed at public hearings.

Mr. CASE. I may say very briefly that I understood that following the hearing this morning General MacArthur said there was nothing he said this morning that might not be given to the public. I heard several Members on both sides of the aisle at the hearing say the same thing after the hearing this morning. But it is my considered opinion that many of the things said by MacArthur this morning would have had a terrific impact on the country if the people had heard what he said, and had heard the way he said it. It would affect the security of the boys in Korea.

Mr. HOLLAND. Anything that does not pertain to the security of the country can be made and will be made available to the country, of course, and the Senator knows that. He knows that his side of the aisle is safeguarded by the presence of nearly half of the members of the joint committees as representatives of his side of the aisle, and if there is any disposition to withhold anything which is really so safe that it can be made public knowledge, that it is within the power of the Senators upon that side of the aisle who sit upon the committees to see that public knowledge is had of those matters. So it seems to me so clear that what is sought to be done is to skim off those things which can be made safely available to the public, but hold back the vital information and facts upon which any judgment to be sound must be based.

I say to the Senator that judgment which is sound cannot be based upon the skimmings. In order for a sound judgment to be made, there must be available the whole substance of the facts which show what is our situation over there in the Orient, what is the condition of our Armed Forces and those who compose them, and of those who may be on one side or the other in the future.

Mr. President, it is perfectly clear from the question of the Senator from South Dakota that what he would like to do,

that what those who support the resolution would like to do, is to skim off hurriedly a few facts, which can be made matters of public knowledge, but to hold back the meat upon which solely any sound judgment can be made, and to allow again, the public to have a partial description of what the facts are, and to allow the formation of public judgments, either sound or unsound, without getting the needed knowledge quickly to Senators who represent the various States in the Nation—and I hope that all of us feel that we represent all the people of this Nation.

I say to the Senator that I think he and those who share his feelings are suggesting a completely unsound method of approach, and I believe we have had too much of that unsoundness already. Now we need to get at the very essential meat of the situation which confronts us in Korea; and in order to get at that meat, we have to delve into the secret matters which cannot be disclosed in the open. It will not be possible for sound judgment to be reached in connection with such matters until those vital questions have been probed and until we have the benefit of the mass of information which is in the mind of the great field commander who until so recently was in command of our men in Korea and the mass of information which is in the minds of others who are in part entrusted with representing us in the military field.

Mr. President, I do not agree with those who conclude that in order to appease the popular demand for information now—not information as to the ultimate facts, which cannot be made public, but information as to the facts which can be made public—the procedure in the committee should be a casual, hurried, skimming off of such harmless facts from the total facts to be presented at the hearings.

Mr. President, the people of Florida, who are writing literally thousands of letters to me about this matter, wish us to get at the vital facts, and in that connection they want the benefit of the expressions of those who represent them as to what are the best interests of our Nation and what we can do to achieve a policy which will be sound and will lead to a victorious conclusion of the struggle in Korea. They do not want a prolongation of the whole question by means of having the committee spend days and days in a useless endeavor to skim off the facts which can be made public, and to separate them from the vital facts which cannot be made public, but on the basis of which alone the decisions can be made.

I say to the Senator from South Dakota that what he and those who are associated with him in his position suggest is that instead of coming to a quick conclusion based upon sound knowledge of the vital facts, we prolong this difficult and dangerous situation by skimming off a lot of facts which can be made public and by conducting the hearings as a sort of Roman holiday, from day to day, and postponing until after that time the determination of the real facts which alone—and I repeat that only the possession of the real facts will

make it possible for anyone—whether it be the distinguished Senator from South Dakota or any other Senator on his side of the aisle or any Senator on this side of the aisle, or any other person representing the public, any Member of the Senate or any Member of the House of Representatives—to reach the sound conclusions which are so necessary. Those who take the position the Senator from South Dakota takes would, in effect, have us prolong this whole miserable experience and postpone for a long period into the future, the getting down to the meat of the coconut. However, that is exactly the wrong way to approach this matter, because it is clear as crystal that it is our duty to probe as quickly as possible in order to reach the ultimate facts as promptly as we can, and then to reach sound conclusions on the basis of those facts. Until we have those facts, it will be impossible for us to reach sound conclusions regarding these matters. In connection with the probe that we must make, we must bear in mind that the facts which we must obtain in order to reach a sound judgment are, by their very nature, a part of the intimate secrets of our Nation, secrets which cannot safely be disclosed to the public; for if they were disclosed, they would bring greater danger and greater suffering and greater punishment to those who represent us in Korea.

Nevertheless, there are some who say, "Let us postpone until some distant time, some days or some weeks from now, the time when we shall come to grips with this problem, and in the meantime let us have a lot of sparring on the inconsequential questions which can safely be brought out into the public gaze."

Mr. President, I say that I do not believe Senators who take that position have thought through this matter. Nevertheless, that is the position essentially, which some Senators now take when they say there should be long hearings, open at first—although such Senators recognize that there must be closed hearings eventually and that the serious, grave facts cannot be disclosed in open hearings. However, they would have a long series of open hearings held and spun out at length, and thereafter would have the committees get down to the matters which really count. Mr. President, that is not the proper way to approach this matter.

I think I have expressed what is the only wise position in regard to this issue. The only proper course is for the Senators who are charged with this inquiry to get at the real facts and the secrets as quickly as possible, and they wish to do so under conditions under which they can examine both secret and nonsecret matters with equal ease and dispatch, just as a matter of course; they wish to proceed with the inquiry in such a way that from minute to minute or from question to question they will not have to be worried as to whether a certain question does or does not break the rule of security, which of course all Senators will be trying to observe.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida whether he agrees with the change of heart that the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee have had in regard to allowing all Senators who wish to attend the hearings to do so?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say that I am one of those who urged that the joint committees take that action.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask a further question. I have the highest regard for the integrity and understanding of the distinguished Senator from Florida, but I wish to ask whether he would have any objection to having the chairman of committee exercise his own judgment in regard to whether the data being presented must be kept secret, in the interest of the security of the country, and whether the Senator would object to having the proceedings in this case conducted along the lines of the previous proceedings, over the years, so far as I recall, namely, by allowing the public to hear the evidence when the security of the Nation is not involved?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have implicit confidence in the sound judgment as well as the patriotism of the Senator from Georgia. Only a short time ago he advised the Senate that he felt he could not assume the responsibility of conducting the hearings without having them conducted in secret and then making known the matters which could safely be disclosed to the public. He made it very plain that the joint committee had already considered the question and had ruled that in its sound judgment it was not proper or wise to proceed on a hit-or-miss basis in the hope that it would catch every improper question ahead of time and would catch every exposure ahead of time in such a way as to preserve the secrets of our Nation. If the Senator from Nevada had been in the Chamber a short time ago, he would have heard the Senator from Georgia speaking from the depths of a very great conviction, say that he felt that to proceed in any other way—in any way other than in closed hearings—would be unsafe and unsound in this situation. He reminded the Senate that, as a Member of the Senate, he sat upon the Committee on Naval Affairs throughout World War II, and that in every hearing that committee held on matters relating to the conduct of the war or matters having to do with the vital secrets of our Nation, the hearings were always secret.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Of course I understand that the present situation in Korea is still a police action and is not world war III; at least, does not the Senator from Florida understand that to be the interpretation which still is made?

Mr. HOLLAND. Regardless of the name by which it is called, I understand that it is a most bitter adventure. I speak of it as the Korean war. When there have been more than 60,000 casualties among our American boys, I

think it is a colossal tragedy and catastrophe, and I think it is entitled to be called a war; and I regard it as such at this time.

At the same time, I remind the Senator from Nevada that it is completely true that it is still a police action; it is an effort on the part of a large number of nations, in which we have assumed and are taking the largest part, by reason of geographic and other considerations, to prevent the outbreak of a world war and an effort to prevent aggressions from crowding out of existence a tiny republic which we helped create and sponsored and which the United Nations sponsored. In that sense of course it is still a police action. But it is grave enough in its size, and in its implications with respect to thousands of American homes and lives, to be dignified by the name of war. The Senator from Florida will not quarrel with the Senator from Nevada, regardless of what name he applies to it. To the Senator from Florida, it is a serious war, as well as a very grave police action.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Of course, I agree with the Senator from Florida that it is a war. I thoroughly disagree with him, however, if he agrees with the President in his conduct of the war; but I do not hear that subject discussed very much. The war is being conducted in the manner of a football game, so that we cannot break up the huddles, but we must stop them at the scrimmage line. We have worn out the thirty-eighth parallel in going back and forth across it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to comment on that point?

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, the Senator from Florida has not agreed, by any manner of means, with all the decisions of the President of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to hear that.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the next place, the Senator from Florida would not be as interested in these hearings as he is, did he not think they will disclose new facts and give new light upon which sounder decisions can be based. In the next place, he does not feel that it is sound for the Senator from Florida or for the Senator from Nevada to depart from the rule of withholding judgment upon this serious matter, which affects tens of thousands of American lives, until he can get the facts, and he wants the facts to be made available with all possible speed. He is saying to the Senator from Nevada and to those who take the same attitude, that it appears to the Senator from Florida that they are trying to raise a sandstorm of all sorts of inconsequential things, though some of them may be tremendously appealing, and to hold back the opportunity to get at the meat in the coconut, and to find out what the real facts are.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Without discussing whether we can win a war while tying the hands of the Army and facing a terrific enemy, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida whether, in the hearings, when a question arises which is of public interest, he could trust the judgment of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and of General MacArthur on the question of what it is necessary to conceal in the interest of the public safety and the national security, and as to what would be merely a historical review of the situation? Would the Senator from Florida be willing to trust their judgment?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida would be willing to trust those distinguished military officers as far as any human being could be trusted, to safeguard our secrets. But the Senator from Florida calls to the attention of the Senator from Nevada three things: first, that mistakes can be made, and they have been made, by the best trained men we have, and with the best of intentions; second, that questions may be asked which will be completely unwise from the standpoint of maintaining our secrets, and they will be used before there is any chance to stop them.

The Senator from Florida reminds the Senator from Nevada of the old courtroom story about the judge making a lawyer withdraw a question to a witness, which question itself had done tremendous damage; the lawyer, of course, withdrew the question very gladly, only to be reminded by counsel on the other side that he withdrew the question, as an attacker would withdraw a red-hot poker which had already been inserted into the vitals of the person attacked, claiming that he had done no harm, since he had withdrawn it. So the Senator from Florida reminds the Senator from Nevada that even in asking questions there is danger of doing irreparable harm.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I see no danger in asking a question in regard to national security, so long as the question does not convey information affecting the national interest. But I would say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I am very happy the majority of the committee changed its attitude and allowed Senators to attend the hearings at which General MacArthur is to testify. It is the firm conviction of the junior Senator from Nevada that if the people of the United States could have heard the testimony this morning, the party would be over.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida expresses his appreciation to the Senator from Nevada. Before the Senator from Nevada leaves the Chamber, the Senator from Florida desires to state the third point of his answer, which he was prevented from doing by the last question of the Senator from Nevada. The third value which is to be remembered is that much greater speed is possible if a complete investigation of each field which is being investigated can be made at the time it is before the committee,

and that it does not make either for a better understanding or for good speed or a quick solution of this matter to have each of the many fields which must be explored only broached in the open hearing, only scraped, if the Senator from Florida may use that term, and then to have all the substance of it relegated to the background, to be held for a period of days or weeks, until the two committees can return to it and the witnesses can be called back, at which time other more important aspects of the question in that field may finally be explored. So, the Senator from Florida feels that the only expeditious way and the only secure way and the only sound way to proceed is as stated by the Senator from Georgia and as determined already by a majority of the two committees sitting jointly, including in that majority at least one Senator who comes from the minority side of the aisle.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Then I would say further to the Senator from Florida that the strategy determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the last 9 or 10 months should have been based upon the forethought and the great deliberation the Senator is describing, instead of their coming up to the barrier, after 9 or 10 months of fighting, with nearly 70,000 casualties, and blood and guts strewn all over Korea, back and forth across that little wart on Asia. The strategy should have been settled in meetings of the great Joint Chiefs of Staff, instead of having the football game which is being played in Korea, for the very reason that England and other empire-minded nations want to save some of their areas in the Far East, such as Hong Kong and Indochina. England has recognized Communist China; and the newspapers today state that 120,000 tons of rubber have been sent into Communist China by England within the past 9 months. Of course, we all know what the British have been doing. The junior Senator from Nevada was in Asia. He flew over Korea twice, and he was in Japan and all over China in 1948. At that time it was well known what the British were doing in the way of sending strictly critical supplies from Hong Kong and Shanghai into Communist China.

I venture the guess that, through the Marshall plan, the 16 Marshall plan countries, the 96 trade treaties which certain of them have with iron curtain countries, and as a result of the materials sent to Singapore by them, at least two-thirds of the materials fired back at American boys in Korea was paid for by the taxpayers of America, the fathers and mothers of those boys.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, before the Senator from Florida answers that long, complicated question, I wonder if he would yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I object. I have waited for a long time to get recognition and have been denied it—

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, what I have to present is a matter of ceremonial comment.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not object to that. I thought the Senator from Connecticut wanted to make some comment about the soundness or unsoundness of the resolution. There has been a filibuster going on because we have not been able to obtain a vote by 2:30 o'clock—

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not yield, Mr. President. The Senator from Nebraska is talking about something that is completely false, and he knows it to be false.

Mr. WHERRY. A point of order, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has made a point of order, and the Senator from Florida will take his seat.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Florida be allowed to proceed in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield for that purpose. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senator from Florida be permitted to proceed in order.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut if I may do so without losing my place on the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Connecticut without losing his place on the floor. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

(At this point Mr. BENTON called attention to the presence in the galleries of distinguished visitors from foreign countries touring the United States as guests of the Trans-World Airlines, and appropriate remarks were made by him and by the Vice President, which appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. HOLLAND's speech.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before I proceed further I should like to ask unanimous consent of the Senate to expunge from the RECORD the single word "false," which I think was inappropriate; and without objection—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the gesture of the distinguished Senator from Florida; and if the word "filibuster" is in any way objectionable I withdraw it. When last night I asked if there was not some way we could proceed to the consideration of the resolution, it was difficult to get cooperation. I deeply appreciate the action of the Senator from Florida, for whom I have the highest regard, and I want to thank him for his friendly gesture.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska and I appreciate his withdrawing the comment which brought on my immoderate statement. Of course, it is completely unnecessary to say that so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned he is not planning anything in the nature of a filibuster, because he expects to conclude shortly, and he is sure the Senator

from Nebraska never meant to attribute any marathon speaking ambitions to the Senator from Florida.

I remind the Senator from Nebraska that the Senator from Florida has sat on the floor of the Senate from January 3 to this moment and has listened to hundreds upon hundreds of hours of speaking on foreign-relations questions and questions with reference to Korea from other Senators, particularly Senators on the other side of the aisle. He believes he has listened to dozens of hours of such speeches by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. He has never expressed any umbrage or fear that the Senator from Nebraska was going to deprive the Senator from Florida of his right to be heard upon the floor. He has never accused the Senator from Nebraska or any other Senator of putting on a filibuster, although he has spent many, many days in listening to the expression of their convictions. Therefore the Senator from Florida was disappointed that the Senator from Nebraska seemed to feel justified in charging the Senator from Florida with doing something that he was not doing. He therefore now appreciates the attitude of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I realize that the Senator from Florida is a very distinguished Senator. His judgment is always respected by other Senators. All of us appreciate his observations. Therefore I could not see why reading the names of the minority members of the committees had anything to do with the facts in the case. Perhaps it was well to emphasize the respect in which we hold them. But I say to the Senator from Florida, really and truly, that we all know who the minority members are. They have a right to their places on the committees. It took the other side a long time to concede it. After the urgency with which I presented my resolution to the Senate I simply could not understand why it was necessary for the distinguished Senator from Florida to read the names, for example. It looked to me as though an effort were being made to continue to talk until after 2:30 o'clock, which would make it very difficult to obtain a vote on the resolution without inconveniencing many Members of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate what the Senator from Nebraska has said. Unfortunately, many people who will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will not have the intimate knowledge of the situation which is possessed in such great degree by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. They do not know, for instance—

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not need to read the names again.

Mr. HOLLAND. They do not know, for instance, the personnel of the various committees. They do not know the high, distinguished, and honorable records which have been made by the members of the committees. For example, they are not aware that a great many of the members have been governors of their

States. The Senator from Florida has a peculiar affection for ex-governors, as the Senator from Nebraska well knows. The Senator from Nebraska knows the background of the members of the committees. He knows which of them have made terrible personal sacrifices, through the loss of members of their own families, in the Armed Forces of our country. The general reading public does not know it. Therefore, the Senator from Florida hopes that the Senator from Nebraska will be patient with his friend from Florida, and will allow him in his own way to conclude the first statement which he should like to make upon the subject of Korea and Asiatic policy, after he has listened for almost endless hours—though he assures the Senator from Nebraska that his remarks have always been most interesting, and that time passed quickly and pleasantly—to the distinguished Senator declaim upon the mistakes which our country has made in Korea, as he feels, and in Asia, as he feels, and as he has shown the depth of his conviction and his willingness to stand upon such convictions.

I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have sometimes agreed with his position, and I do now agree with some of his criticisms. I do not agree with the idea of making a Roman holiday out of a hearing which is designed to probe into the depths of our military policy and strategy and our most closely guarded military secrets about a war which is still going on and is a bigger war today than it has been prior to this time, when we do not know that the end of it is in sight and there are 250,000 American boys over there whose lives and safety depend upon our reaching sound solutions. Therefore I am certainly not in accord with the policy advanced, I think mistakenly, by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I think it is based upon very poor judgment. I think it is exceedingly unwise. However, I know that the Senator has a deep conviction about it, or he would not urge it.

The Senator from Nebraska is seeking to make a Roman holiday out of a hearing in which there must come the time—and apparently the Senator from Nebraska hopes it will come much later than the Senator from Florida hopes it will come—when intimate secrets of our Nation, with respect to our military planning and strategy must be bared to the able and patriotic Senators from both sides of the aisle upon whose shoulders and hearts and consciences lie the heavy responsibility of making sound recommendations.

The Senator from Florida feels that it is unwise to go into the question in such a way. He does not feel that only a few of the most easily discovered and most harmless facts should be brought out over a period of days and that there should be held back for a period of days, or perhaps weeks, the coming to grips with the serious issues. The Senator from Florida has heard the Senator from Nebraska repeatedly, in the course of this spring, and other Senators on that side of the aisle, and this side also, talk about our boys having to fight a war

with one hand tied behind their backs. I remind the Senator from Nebraska that if he forces open hearings he will put the 23 or 25 or 26 Senators—depending on whether or not all of them are present—in the position of having to devote almost all of their time for days or weeks to the vain effort to satisfy the avid curiosity of people who want to hear things but who cannot, when the payoff comes, safely be allowed to hear the real facts in the controversy. The Senator from Nebraska knows that perfectly well.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. The sooner we get the real facts produced in private the sooner decisions can be made. It is such decisions on vital policy which the Senator from Florida eagerly awaits and wants to get to as quickly as possible. He does not like delaying tactics of the kind represented by the resolution, under which the actual bringing in of facts would be suspended for a period of days or perhaps weeks.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no quarrel with the position of the Senator from Florida. He has a perfect right to his convictions. The committees have a perfect right to hold executive or closed sessions. My judgment is that open hearings bring out the facts and bring out the truth. I have just as strong convictions as has the Senator from Florida. I have just been handed a report taken from the news ticker in the cloakroom.

It says:

President Truman told a group of foreign newspapermen that if the people of the world can get the truth peace will come automatically.

I suppose the Senator agrees with that statement.

He spoke to the group in the Rose Garden at the White House.

He spoke to a group of newspaper representatives from 14 countries. The statement is emphasized again:

Mr. Truman said he hoped they had seen and found for themselves some things which they can tell their people when they get home.

I emphasize the words "found for themselves some things which they can tell their people." Not something that was skimmed off for them.

Mr. Truman said, "If we can get the truth to the people, peace will come automatically."

That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to get the truth to the people.

I have a right to my convictions. When I say I want open hearings, I want open hearings only in respect to defense policies which the great men who will come to testify agree can be made public. Certainly the Senator does not mean that General MacArthur, General Bradley, or General Collins, for example, or Mr. Acheson, would go before the committees and intentionally violate the espionage laws of our country. Such a contention is completely ridiculous. I am surprised that the

distinguished Senator, whose judgment is very highly regarded in the Senate, should even suggest such a thing.

No one is asking for a Roman holiday. All we are asking is that the people of the United States get the facts, and not the skimmed-off facts which come from secret hearings, or statements which may be misinterpreted. When I left the committee hearing this morning literally scores of newspapermen gathered around me and asked, "What did he say?" Already certain statements have been made as to what was said. They represent the skimmed-off portion.

What we want is open hearings on everything which has to do with the defense policy. General MacArthur has placed on the table his proposals. Why can we not have the evidence to support those proposals? Why cannot the people of the country be informed as to what those proposals are? That is all I am asking. I hope the Senator, in his fairness, will not charge me with seeking by the resolution to have a Roman holiday or a big show.

I went through all the hearings in the so-called Connally committee, when the question of troops for Europe was under consideration. While it is true that the hearings were not televised, yet I believe that my mail will substantiate the statement that the people of the country were better informed when we finished than they would have been if they had been carried by television, and much better informed than they would have been if closed hearings had been held.

The trouble has not been with open hearings. The trouble has been with secret hearings. In my opinion, the last two World Wars were caused by secret hearings. I believe that the blood of the boys to whom the Senator has referred would not have been shed on the battlefields of Korea if the Wedemeyer report had not been suppressed for three long years. It has now been made public. We know what is in it. If we had followed the course outlined in his report at that time, the great generals whom the Senator loves, General Ridgway, and General Van Fleet, about whom he spoke so highly the other day, would not even be in Korea today.

All I am asking is that the things which do not need to be suppressed shall not be suppressed. It is the secret agreements—Yalta, Potsdam, and all others of them—which have brought the United States into war. It is secret agreements which are responsible for the bloodshed the Senator has been talking about in his defense of secret hearings. Give us open hearings, and let the people of the country know the facts. Open hearings will result in unity among the people. The people will then support whatever policy is determined upon. But when we try to skim off certain facts and give the people what some persons want them to hear, we get into trouble.

Mr. President, my convictions are just as strong as those of the Senator from Florida. If I have been impatient about obtaining consideration for the resolution, I want the Senator from Florida to forgive me. I should like to have the dis-

tinguished Senator from Florida now say that he will help me to obtain a vote on this proposal sometime during the day. I think the people have the right to know the facts. Those who believe in opening the hearings think the people should be informed about the things they should know. Those who do not want the people informed want the hearings to be closed.

I am not quarreling with the Senator's position. I am not quarreling with anyone who wants closed hearings. That is all right with me. I simply do not agree with that procedure. I believe that history has substantiated the convictions which I hold as to open hearings. I have no secrets. If I had, someone would find them out anyway. I should like to see anyone keep the newspaper men from finding out what happened today at the hearing. I listened to about an hour of the testimony. I did not hear it all. I will say to the Senator from Florida that every word I heard could have been given in open hearings to the people of the United States. If they had been permitted to hear the testimony, that fact would have done as much to help unify the people as anything we have heard about in hearings since I have been a Member of this body, during the past 9 years. I say that honestly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. There are two comments which I wish to make upon his statement.

First, with reference to the Wedemeyer report, it required the action of the joint committee, through its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], even to get the report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. That was the first showing, and a very definite showing of the fairness and thoroughness of the committee. One of the first things it asked for was the Wedemeyer report; and as soon as members of the Committee had an opportunity to assure themselves that the question of national security was not involved, they made the report available. It seems to the Senator from Florida that instead of criticizing the functioning of the committee, at least with reference to that report, the Senator from Nebraska ought to be paying warm praise to the committee for having already given earnest evidence of its desire to serve patriotically by making public something which could safely be made public. Time after time during the past 3 years I have heard the Senator yearn for publication of the report.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what resulted in the report being made public. It was the yearning and the speeches which were made to pry it loose.

Mr. HOLLAND. The next thing I wish to comment on is this: The Senator's position voices the attitude that it is a good thing to proceed with those parts of the facts, those crumbs from the table, which can safely be made available to the public, and to hold back the meat of the issue until later. That is exactly where the Senator from Florida thinks the judgment of the Senator from Nebraska is very badly at fault. I do not question

the patriotism of the Senator from Nebraska. However, I believe that the sooner the witnesses can give to committees of the Senate the vital facts without which we cannot intelligently pass upon these questions, the better.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield after a bit; not now.

The Senator from Nebraska may feel that from the wealth of his experience and observations he has amply safe ground upon which to base a permanent judgment. However, so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, so far as the devoted members of these two committees are concerned, and, he believes, so far as the sound thinking people of the nation are concerned, they know perfectly well that no skimming of the froth is going to serve any good purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at this time. I allowed the Senator to speak for 10 minutes without ever voicing a question.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has spoken for 3 hours.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will allow me to say what I would like to say, I should like to remind him that when any witness, whether it be General Bradley, General MacArthur, some diplomat, or some other person not even yet named as a witness, completes his public statement, if he has knowledge of secret facts, then is the time, if we are to consider his testimony as a cohesive whole, to investigate the things of which he has intimate knowledge. Under the Senator's program that would be impossible.

I remind the Senator—and I hope he will pay attention—

Mr. WHERRY. I am listening.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now before he leaves that point? He is going to another point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to make my point, if I may.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has made three points.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the Senator's impatience, but I should like to make my point, if I may.

The Senator from Nebraska would like to have one of the generals make his statement in general, without at all disclosing any secrets, but simply voicing his opinion, as to what he thinks the proper policy should be, without being subjected at that very time, at that very hearing, to the necessity of having to answer certain questions from Senators on both sides of the aisle as to what are the facts underlying the decision which he thinks is wise—the facts as to men, as to matériel, as to experience; the facts as to the attitude of our allies, and as to the attitude of those who may be our allies or may be our enemies in the future. I say to the Senator that it is completely wrong to have the public get the impression that such and such an expression of opinion from a distinguished witness is the ultimate fact, without having available the facts upon which that opinion is based.

The Senator knows that good people do not always agree. I am prepared to

admit that the Senator is a very distinguished and highly patriotic American. The Senator, however, does not always agree with the Senator from Georgia on these questions, yet the Senator from Florida feels that the Senator from Georgia is also a distinguished and highly patriotic American. Men's minds differ on vital questions. The Senator from Nebraska proposes to adopt a program under which only those comparatively innocuous things which do not go to the root of any of the problems can come out at the time of the expression of the policy which one of the witnesses feels should be adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to yield until I have finished my statement. I fear that the Senator's impatience sometimes runs away with his manners.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is perfectly courteous and good manners to ask the Senator to yield before finishing a point, or before making three or four more points, or making a speech.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida has not finished his point.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator was saying—well all right, I will refrain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield when I get through making my point.

My point, Mr. President, is that it is unfair to the public and it is unfair to the witness and it is unfair from every point of view to have a mere expression of opinion on policy go out as the ultimate, unassailable fact of the matter, without having at the same time the opportunity and the chance to delve into and to explore the facts which lie behind that expression of policy and which, by their very existence, determine the wisdom or unwisdom of that policy. The Senator knows perfectly well that the Senator from Florida is correct in that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is because it is so obvious on the face of it that any mere expression of opinion, whether it is General MacArthur's opinion, or Mr. Acheson's opinion, or whosoever's opinion it is, is only an opinion until the facts upon which it is based can be made public. Yet the Senator proposes a program under which opinions become permanent, and the expression of opinions is substituted for the opportunity to explore into what the ultimate facts may be. The Senator from Florida thinks that is a very unwise decision, and a very unwise way to proceed; and he thinks that the members of these two committees have deliberated to good advantage and have brought forth a wise decision, much wiser than that which the quick efforts of those who have presented this resolution would leave us make. He thinks the Senator from Georgia, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, is much better qualified than is the Senator from Florida or the distinguished Senator from Nebraska to know what the implications are in investigating these questions, as to their importance to national

security, and as to what particular facts need to be explored to determine whether or not an opinion based upon facts is sound or unsound.

The Senator from Georgia and a considerable majority of the committees sitting jointly have come to the conclusion, with which I agree implicitly, that it is unsound and would be unwise to adopt the course which the Senator suggests, and which would leave opinions expressed without giving any chance at all to look for the foundation upon which those opinions are based. The Senator knows that is not good policy, it is not logical, it is not sound, and the Senator even appears to be speechless when confronted with that situation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. KERR. In the course of the discussion by the Senator from Nebraska he intimated or stated or alleged that the procedure taking place was one of skimming off what the committees wanted the public to know, and keeping the cream of the information from the public. Is the Senator from Florida aware of the procedure now in effect in the committees whereby every question and every answer is taken down, and subject only to deletions of information by one charged with the responsibility of protecting the security of the United States; that with that exception alone, every question asked and every answer made is immediately given to the press?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida understands that is the practice; and he cannot, to save his life, see why the Senator from Nebraska and others who, like him, support the resolution, are unwilling to have those who best know what is required for the security of this country made the deletions to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further.

Mr. KERR. Then is it not a fact that the only thing being skimmed off is what the ones charged with the direct responsibility for the national security conceive or consider to be information which would be of benefit to the enemy were it published?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. And the obverse of the statement is true. The only matters made available under the program suggested here by the Senator from Nebraska are those things which cannot even be construed as being remotely connected with the national security. The public will get a great deal more information by following the program which has been put into force than by following such a program as that suggested by the Senator from Nebraska, in which he proposes that only those things that can safely be mentioned come out, and that everything else be held back, and that if there is a question about any matter, of course that matter shall be held back.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from

Florida yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if it is quite clear to him why the Wedemeyer report was held secret for 3½ years, and just recently released.

Mr. HOLLAND. Not having seen the secret and expurgated portions of that report, which are shown even now to have been eliminated, the Senator from Florida does not know what the implication of the inclusion of those parts of the report would have been; and he suspects that if it had been released earlier there would have been a great many more items taken out. I judge from the developments now that the time has come when those charged with the preservation of the secrets of our Nation feel that by cutting out only a little, they can make most of the body of the report available. They may have been mistaken in their earlier action. Probably they should have made the report available a long time ago; I do not know about that. But neither the Senator from Kansas—and I say it with all respect—nor the Senator from Florida, is competent to judge that question, because neither of us knows what was in the portions that were eliminated. Neither of us knows what may have been in other portions that would have been of vital benefit to an enemy if it had been released earlier.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. The Senator from Kansas does not hold himself out as a military expert, nor is the Senator from Kansas privileged to be a member of the great Foreign Relations Committee or the Armed Services Committee. Sometimes we secure information as to what goes on in those committees second or third hand.

I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if he does not believe that some of the basic matters in the Wedemeyer report, which cannot be construed to be matters of strictly secret information, could well have been brought to the attention of the American people before 3½ years had elapsed? I should also like to ask the Senator, if he will pardon me for asking two questions in one, whether that type of procedure has not led to the public of this great country being distrustful of those who are doing such things?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has asked two questions, first as to whether the Wedemeyer report, or the substance of it, could have been made available earlier. The Senator from Florida is inclined to think it could have been. The Senator from Florida does not, however, nor does the Senator from Kansas, have all the facts upon which he can be perfectly assured that his opinion is correct. I speak now for the Senator from Florida, and I think I can speak for the Senator from Kansas, because neither of us has seen the deleted portions of the report.

As to the other question, I think candor requires me to say that it would

have brought good results if the report had been made public earlier.

I do not want to hold back information. Information which can be given out without violating the security needs of the Nation should be given out, of course. I agree that some of these matters have been withheld from the public too long, and when that is done the practice tends to diminish public confidence.

I am trying to have us move swiftly ahead now, in this hearing, as we endeavor to meet the vital problems confronting the Nation.

At this moment the Senator and I are not talking about an academic question; we are talking about 250,000 live American boys. Some of them will not be alive tomorrow night, and more of them will not be alive a month from now. I and those who feel as I do think it is imperative to get to the heart of this question, and that the only way to do so is to let the large group of very fine and very honorable men who are members of the two committees—Senators from both sides of the aisle—follow their own judgment, as it has already been expressed, and quickly reach the very heart of this question, and then make their recommendations to the Senate.

The other method is a sparring method, one which shows, even before the investigation starts, that it would not be the purpose to explore the substantial questions at an early stage of the inquiry, but, instead, that the purpose would be to conduct a sort of Roman holiday in the course of which the 200, 300, or 400 persons who could obtain admittance to the hearing room would be given a chance to see what occurred there, but by which the vital security of the Nation would not best be served and by which the speedy solution of the problems confronting us would not best be served.

I feel with deep conviction that it is tremendously important to the Nation that we move as quickly as possible to the heart of this question. I believe it would not best serve the interests of the Nation if we were to postpone the solution or if we were to have the members of the committee devote their time to mere expressions of opinion, which, after all, are likely to vary widely. It is inevitable that men will differ in their opinions as to what the wise course is. Therefore, the giving of publicity to mere expressions of opinion would simply intensify the dispute and the discussion and the confusion and the lack of harmony prevailing in the Nation, whereas I want with all my heart to have the Senate move as quickly as possible to do away with such confusion and lack of harmony.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Does not the Senator from Florida feel that it is a responsibility of those in the Pentagon and those who have access to the secret information to see that certain columnists do not have access to it, when it

is withheld from the Senate and the House of Representatives?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator means that certain columnists have had information which Senators were not able to obtain, I certainly agree with the Senator. At the same time, I would not at all agree that the most secret matters of the Nation have been disclosed. I remind my friend, the Senator from Kansas, that the atomic-bomb secret was so carefully safeguarded that no one had any notice of the fact that hundreds of millions of dollars had been expended for that purpose and thousands and thousands of persons were working on that task and entire cities had been created and were contributing, by means of the efforts of those who dwelt in them, to studying that problem and to reaching the solution which brought a much speedier end to the war. So I know, as does the Senator from Kansas, that that secret was well safeguarded.

I also know, by reason of having been given, only recently, certain secret facts in connection with the discussion before one of our committees, in secret hearings, of the so-called dispersal program, that there are many other things in which just as good secrecy is being maintained.

So I think the Senator from Kansas errs if he reaches the conclusion that because certain wrong things have been done by letting certain secrets out of the bag, so to speak, on a few occasions, those who are charged with the custody of our most vital secrets have been convicted of being untrue to their trust or of giving everything away. I do not believe that is so. Otherwise I would have to reach the point—and I know the Senator from Kansas feels the same way about the matter—where I did not believe that almost all the men who devote their very lives to the service of our Nation in high military and civil posts wish to serve the Nation truly and well. Most of these men are fine men and are true to their trust. I know perfectly well that because they have been trustworthy many matters which necessarily will be delved into during the hearings are still secret and these secret matters go to the very heart of the solution of the difficult problem which confronts us. I wish to have the committee and the Senate reach that vital stage in this entire matter as quickly as possible.

I believe that sparring and talk and expression of opinion before committees would merely delay our reaching the necessary conclusions. After all, opinions have already been expressed before the joint session of Congress and in various parts of the Nation and more opinions will be expressed.

On the other hand, what we need are the facts. Many of them are not going to be communicable to the public. The distinguished Senator from Kansas, himself a veteran of highly honorable service, knows this is true and knows perfectly well that the sooner we brush away all this fog and the sooner we reach the question of how we can with the greatest possible dispatch and the greatest possible certainty have available to us the facts upon which alone

we can base sound judgment, the better our country will be served.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am sure the Senator missed the point of my question. I asked whether there is a responsibility on the part of those who hold these secrets to see that the information is not disseminated by a few columnists, thus leading the people of the Nation to believe that those columnists have inside information, particularly when some columnists are clever enough at times to obtain just enough secret or inside information to be able to lead the public to believe that they do have a great deal of inside information—all of which leads to a further breaking down of public confidence, as has been the case when the Wedemeyer report has for 3½ years been kept off the list of items available for public information, and only now has been released, thus causing many of the public to raise their eyebrows and ask, "Well, what would you expect?"

Does not the Senator think that is bad?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no quarrel with the Senator from Kansas on that point. However, I think the course followed by the present investigation is best, and I think the different course now advocated by some for the investigation would cause it to have less value, would cause greater delay to occur, and would cause greater public confusion and dissenation to occur.

I believe that the members of the two committees that are exploring this question should be allowed to proceed in their own way, in accordance with the method on which they have already determined, and should be allowed to reach the heart of the problem as quickly as possible. That cannot be the case if there is to be a succession of public hearings, at which, first, one man will express his opinion, and then another man will be called in to express a contrary opinion, and then various shades of opinion will be expressed by other witnesses—all with the result that the issue will simply be beclouded before the time when the actual nuggets of truth are brought before the members of the committee, so that they can base sound recommendations upon a real knowledge of the facts.

I believe that the method proposed to be followed under the resolution is a wrong and an unwise one, and would cause confusion to become worse confounded, and would not result in having us reach speedy, clear, and sound conclusions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

WELCOME TO REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PRESS OF 14 NATIONS OF EUROPE, AFRICA, AND ASIA

During the delivery of Mr. HOLLAND's speech.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am grateful to the minority leader for withdrawing his objection, and I am particularly grateful to the Vice President for taking the chair and permitting me to introduce to the Senate some distinguished visitors in the galleries.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], and I have just had lunch with 35 distinguished journalists who are touring the country as guests of the Trans-World Airlines and are completing a trip throughout the United States. I have been acting as host at the luncheon, and I should like to state to the Senate that my guests have outdone the normal courtesy we expect from guests. I should like to call attention to some of the names on the scroll which they so generously and courteously bestowed upon me, in order to show the wide range of countries from which they come. I read the names of Alexandre Breugnot, Dr. Sayed Abouel Naga, Naguib Canaan, Nicholas Nahas. There are many others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire scroll may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the scroll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. WILLIAM BENTON,

United States Senate:

We, the undersigned representatives of the press of 14 nations of Europe, Africa, and Asia, as members of the Trans-World Airlines flight to the United States of America, express our deepest gratitude for your courtesy and hospitality during our visit to the United States. By your efforts you have helped us gain a first-hand knowledge of how Americans work and live in freedom under a system of democratic free enterprise.

We have learned much from you to tell our readers, and we desire by this scroll to honor your contribution to the spread of truth and understanding among the peoples of the world.

Alexandre Breugnot, Dr. Sayed Abouel Naga, Naguib Canaan, Nicholas Nahas, Donald Edgar, N. H. N. Dixon, Stanley Jackson, Norman Cursley, James L. Manning, Charles Eade, Pierre Marschal, James De Coquet, Sam Cohen, Merry Bromberger, Otto Herr, Oskar Reschke, Harris Bousboureilis, Demetrios Yannoukakis, Coryndon Mandy, S. N. Ghosh, Uenkatscha Nalk, Peter O'Curry, Michael G. Rooney, Joseph Haim Heftmann, Gino Ben Amozegh, Giovanni Artieri, Ugo Zatterin, Guglielmo Ceroni, Morais Cahral, Armando Ferreira, Jaime Arias, Toccuato Lura De Tena, Georges Rigassi, Albert Muller, Philippe Casanova.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, from the standpoint of the objectives of the people of the United States to achieve an understanding with the people of other nations, I think no group that has visited this country is more important than is this group of traveling journalists. I congratulate Trans-World Airlines on its leadership and generosity in assembling this group and bringing them on this tour of our country.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] described to us a previous trip organized by Trans-World Airlines on which they took a group of American journalists overseas. This, it seems to me, is far-sighted statesmanship on the part of Mr. Howard Hughes, Mr. Ralph Damon, and Mr. Warren Pierson, the three top executives of TWA.

Mr. President, it further dramatizes the fact that private activity in the field of exchange of persons is being conducted all the time on a scale infinitely more vast than anything sponsored or paid for by the Federal Government. Of the 40,000 or 50,000 foreign students now at our universities and colleges, only a tiny percentage, I venture to suggest only 5 percent, are in any way sponsored or underwritten by the Federal Government. Only recently the Ford Foundation, that great new philanthropy which has almost a 90-percent financial interest in the Ford Motor Co., has given a large grant to the Institute of International Education in New York City so that it may expand its office and open regional offices all over the Nation to do a better job on the private level in the exchange of persons between the nations of the world.

Of all persons who come to visit us, I suggest that these journalists are most important, because they will learn that we have nothing to conceal from them. They will, of course, learn that we have things of which we are not too proud. They will learn that we recognize that there are certain aspects of American life which under our democratic processes we hope to improve, correct, and make progress with in the years to come. We have nothing to hide. They can go back to their countries and write as authorities about us, as persons who have been here and have seen us face to face.

I hope, therefore, that the Senate will join me in welcoming them today, and I trust they will be the forerunner of many other such groups, representing not only newspapers and journalists, and all other media of communication, but people from the many and varied walks of life, from industry, labor unions, and other groups overseas, upon whose understanding our friendly relations ultimately depend as we look ahead over the next decade.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for giving me this opportunity to advise the Senate of the presence of these distinguished visitors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Florida will permit, the Chair would like to say a word on behalf of the Senate to express our pleasure at having with us and welcoming to this body these distinguished visitors from 14 nations representing the press. Unfortunately the Chair would advise our friends that they have pretty stiff competition today in the matter of attendance of Senators here and elsewhere. As newspapermen they will appreciate that fact.

We are glad to have you not only in the Senate, but to have you visit the United States, and we hope that your sojourn with us will be profitable to you and to us, mutually, in the dissemination of information and understanding among the peoples of all the countries represented by you and, insofar as possible, the people of the world, concerning the real objectives and purposes of democracy here and throughout the world. We hope that however long you may remain with us, you may continue to enjoy your visit and that you will take home with you valuable information concern-

ing our institutions, and leave us with valuable information concerning yours.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Chair.

AUTHORITY FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN SENATE BILL 271 AFTER RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be permitted to sign the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes after the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPEN VERSUS CLOSED HEARINGS AT MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES OF ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had hoped that we could have a vote on this resolution early this afternoon, and that after its disposition those who were still in the Senate Chamber might have availed themselves of the opportunity to participate in the MacArthur hearings. That, however, is not in the cards, and at this hour it appears that the entire afternoon will be devoted to the consideration of the motion to consider the resolution.

I presume that in my time I have erred on the side of anything but brevity, but I think there is still some virtue in the New Testament admonition, "But let your communication be, Yea, yea; nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." So I shall not try to detain the Senate long this afternoon, but I believe there are some things which ought to be disposed of.

First, after having listened for the past 2 hours to the constantly recurring allusion to the question of national security, I am wondering whether it does not at times become a smokescreen and something of a fetish, and that it is entirely overdone. I remember that in the days of World War II I could not get into my office in the House Office Building without having a badge and a pocket card and many other things. Every time one went to one of the agencies of Government, even though he may not have been peculiarly invested with security significance, he had to have a badge, he had to know the "high sign" and the password. It was more difficult than getting into a lodge. I think a great many persons, who take a rather rational and common sense view of the matter, have come to the conclusion that, at least in some respects, it has been highly overdone.

But, Mr. President, first I wish to answer the observation made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], which left a rather peculiar implication in my mind, when he said that General MacArthur had been queried as to whether he wanted open or closed hearings. I submit that if General MacArthur had undertaken to pass upon that question, he would have been

hoist with his own petard, anyway one may take it.

I am going to address a question to my friend from Oklahoma, and I neither mean to be facetious about it nor to take undue advantage, but I am wondering what my friend from Oklahoma would have said had he been in General MacArthur's position and the committee had queried him, and had said, "Do you want open or closed hearings?" I know what I would have said. I would have said precisely what General MacArthur said, namely, that I would leave it entirely in the hands of the committee. Had he for a moment deviated from the line and indicated that he wanted open hearings, then, of course, everyone at once would have come out of his corner and said, "There it is, there is the ostentation, there is the display spirit in the man. There is his love for grandeur and demonstration. He wants an open hearing. He wants a place where, as in the Colosseum, there will be great multitudes to applaud." That would have been the answer on the part of those who today attack him, had he for one moment said he wanted open hearings.

On the other hand, suppose he had said to the Senator from Georgia, "I should like to have the hearings closed." Then what? Then, of course, the same persons would have said, "There you have it. He wants to testify behind closed doors. He does not have a case. He is not willing in public to ventilate his views and present his convictions for all to hear." He would have been caught either way, had he answered that question. So he gave the proper answer, namely, that it was in the hands of those who summoned him, those who invited him to come to testify. So let there be not comfort in that. I am sure that Senators who were listening this afternoon to the observations by the Senator from Georgia probably had not thought through that matter.

When it comes to the question of secrecy, I remember an occasion when General of the Army Eisenhower, General Marshall, the Secretary of War, and a great many others, were called to testify before a closed hearing of the House Appropriations Committee. I was then a very humble member of that committee. I remember one had to have a special card and a special badge in order to get into the committee room. We sat there, seemingly entranced by the disclosures and revelations. We were privileged to ask many questions. It was not a very good show, to say the least, and I do not know that we learned a great deal from it. But only 2 days later, Time magazine came out with a double-page spread which told more in four paragraphs than was revealed in the course of that entire hearing. There we were, adjured and admonished to maintain secrecy in the interest of national security. I wonder if that is not being overdone.

It seems to me that had we had a little more light in other days, some of the young men whose warm blood is ebbing out on the fields of Korea might still be alive. It is strange that other countries and other peoples get to know so much,

while the American people are kept in the dark. When it comes to the question of security, one might think from the discussion heard here this afternoon that the witnesses are a lot of imbeciles. When General MacArthur takes the witness chair, he will be able to evaluate for himself whether a particular answer might jeopardize the security of the country. If a Member of the Senate should ask him the question, "How many troops do you have in Korea, and how are the divisions deployed?" certainly he would make no answer that would jeopardize security. He would be indeed a poor soldier if he did. The man who served as Chief of Staff with such glory and distinction, and who served in many wars, has some sense of values, and so he will be able to answer and still abide by all the obligations and responsibilities which are upon him. If I estimate the situation correctly, he is still amenable to the Espionage Act. Under its provisions and under the other obligations which are imposed upon him, certainly, if he should give aid and comfort to the enemy by any answer he might make, he would be subject to a penalty.

I have not the slightest doubt that General Bradley, General Marshall, General Collins, and all the others will not need General Davis and his censorship to indicate to them what is safe to disclose, when the security of the United States is involved. But let us not make a smoke screen of national security for the purpose of preventing the people of the United States from knowing what is going on.

It has been repeatedly stated here today that open hearings might jeopardize the lives of young men in Korea. Let me answer those who have lifted their voices with that kind of argument by saying that even more lives may be jeopardized by the secretiveness which has marked so much of our policy for a long time, going all the way back to Yalta, in the winter of 1945. Yes, I think we have an acute recollection of the secrecy which was practiced in those days.

For the purposes of the record, I remind Senators that I recall, of course, the long-drawn-out Pearl Harbor hearings. Oh, with what convenience and facility remembrance and recollection had suddenly become an outmoded virtue. As a matter of fact the witnesses could hardly remember facts which seemed to have been seared indelibly in the minds of millions of other people; but, week after week, and week after week, Members of this body, in conjunction with the body in which I served at the other end of the Capitol in those days, sought to adduce the truth in the best way they knew how. They encountered first one stalemate and then another, and, to this good hour, the whole story of all the evil and vile secrecy which was involved in the days before Pearl Harbor has not yet been disclosed for the cold print of the history books, where the people of America may soberly and accurately evaluate exactly what occurred. In my considered judgment, it was the fruition of a design which

makes a pretty definite pattern. If anyone wants to refresh himself about it, the Library of Congress and the files of this body and the files of the body at the other end of the Capitol are replete with documentary evidence as to whether there was a design which finally brought us to that ill-fated day, and which ultimately shunted us into the greatest cataclysm which has ever been visited upon mankind.

We remember the secrecy of that day. We remember, Mr. President, the secrecy that enshrouded the conference at Yalta, from which have come so many evil effects which now challenge not only our best thinking but challenge the destiny of young men and the very treasure of our country. As I go back to it, Mr. President, it is with a sense of dismay that I think of a conference in the Crimean Peninsula in the winter of 1945 in which the conferees thought they might carry out a grand design, but in so doing, in the enfolding darkness and secrecy, they led this country down the course of disaster, and today our young men have to pay the bill with their blood and their lives.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does not the distinguished Senator from Illinois feel that unless some of the secrecy is done away with and the people are given an opportunity to know what is going on, the mistakes of the past can be repeated with even greater detrimental effect on the country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed, so. I say to my good friend from Kansas that I was positively dismayed by some of the statements I heard this morning. The genial Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] said that we winnow out and finally we get to that which we can safely entrust to the people. Is not that wonderful, Mr. President? The Government reaches into the hearts and firesides of the Nation and takes the choice sons of the families of America and says, "We are going to put you into uniforms, give you some training, and send you to Korea. But you must not know what is going on. It is not safe to trust you or your good father, or your good mother who brought you into this world."

Think of all the nice expressions about the democratic process. The Vice President of the United States, this afternoon, as he addressed himself to the distinguished foreign journalists who graced this body with their presence, used the phrase, "democratic process." Is it the democratic process to conceal? Is it the democratic process to withhold? Is it the democratic process to do those clandestine things in connection with which the people of the United States have an interest because this is their country? Is it their sons who have to be offered upon the altar. It is their dollars which must be used to fight the wars of the Republic. Their dollars are good enough; their sons are good enough; but the people are not expected to know what is going on. We can call that the democratic process if we like, but I have another name for it, Mr. President.

I go back to the deceitful and infamous undertaking at Yalta in February of 1945. The masters of secrecy were there, Mr. President. Harry Hopkins was there. I knew him. Alger Hiss was there. If there is any doubt about it, read the story of Yalta by the late Secretary of State Edward Stettinius, whom I knew very well.

I say to my good friend from Kansas that it is wonderful to talk about secrecy and about leaks, when Judy Coplon was in the Department of Justice and Alger Hiss in the Department of State. There was Marzani in the Department of State, who was indicted on 11 counts, found guilty, and sentenced to prison for revealing from the records things which should not have been revealed.

Let those in the executive branch clean their own dunghill before they monitor the morals of the United States Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to secrecy. Yes, they were in Crimea doing business at Yalta; and what happened? It is an open story. They gave virtual control of the Chinese Eastern Railroad and the Manchurian Railroad to Marshal Stalin. He can use it now to carry tanks and planes and supplies with which to decimate young Americans in Korea.

That happened at Yalta, Mr. President, behind the dark folds of a secret curtain. We were not to know about it. At the same time many naval bases in the Kurile Islands were given to the Soviets. It was a long time before we found it out. They will be useful now for Red submarines and Soviet aircraft. Our representatives at Yalta gave away the north half of Sakhalin Island. There is some oil there. Russia may bring these hidden riches to the surface, and refine them into that high-octane essence which makes a plane whiz through the sky as a vehicle for a bomb which may yet wipe out lives of many young Americans in Korea. We gave those things to Stalin at Yalta. We gave all those rights to Russia, and they were many. It was done with secrecy, and 6 years later young Americans, with the exuberance of life in every fiber, vein, and pore, now pay the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois if the American people and the American Congress were not told by the executive department that there were not secret agreements entered into, and if now we do not find that there were.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed, so. I want to say to my friend from Kansas that it was diplomatic secrecy. The theory was once expressed by an eastern professor, as he evaluated the Roosevelt policy, that we had deceived the country. That is a fine philosophy, Mr. President, but I do not subscribe to it. To hear the statements today we would think that Members of the Senate had no confidence in the power of the American people to evaluate. I have plenty of confidence in the people, so I believe that in the interest of unity we serve our country best when we take away the

shroud of secrecy and let the light shine in.

If there is something of specific moment in a question that might endanger the security of the country, I would not expect a witness under cross-examination by a Member of the Senate to answer the question. I think it would be his responsibility to say, "This involves an element of security which I do not believe should be disclosed on an occasion of this kind." But what we are interested in particularly, Mr. President, is the whole question of policy, and I believe the American people are entitled to get the facts first hand. As it is, they are to be evaluated and they are to be censored, at least to the extent that censorship will be imposed. Then the screened transcript will be made available to the American people. Perhaps the testimony will not be screened; I do not know; but whatever it is, it will be allegedly a screened transcript.

As we think of this kind of secrecy, Mr. President, I wonder why there was not quite the same interest in the days when the Senate and House were dealing with the Amerasia case. A naval lieutenant here and a greeting-card publisher in New York with a definite leftist record entered into a conspiracy. They took more than 1,700 documents from the State Department to their photostating office in New York City. They took what they wanted from the documents. Some of the documents certainly were marked "classified." How much news was there about it at that time? How many persons lifted up their voices and said, "We must do something about this?" Nothing was done, except that one of them got a \$500 fine, as I recall. I draw entirely on memory, because I have not looked at the record for years. I believe two of them were scolded. One of them got off with a substantially heavier fine. No one went to jail. If ever I read facts in a case which involved a clear and distinct violation of the espionage laws, in my judgment the Amerasia case did. How much was made of secrecy at that time? It is only because this seems to be a special occasion that there is so much emphasis placed upon it.

I wish to refer again to Yalta, because I believe that the record must be made, and refreshed from time to time. I had a great affection for a man who formerly graced the Senate. He is a man of brilliance and integrity. He has occupied many positions of influence and importance in the Government. I refer to my old friend Jimmy Byrnes, of South Carolina. He was a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations years ago when I was a member of the House Appropriations Committee. We used to cross sabers at times. I had not only affection for him, but I had a great admiration and respect for his ability. When he came back from Europe he did quite a job in writing contemporary history in his interesting book called *Speaking Frankly*. At page 41 of the book he mentions a cablegram which was sent from Yalta to the White House, allegedly by Mr. Hopkins to Mr. Byrnes, with respect to still another secret of Yalta, namely, the veto.

At page 41 the former Secretary of State quotes the cablegram:

The President is extremely anxious that no aspect of this question be discussed, even privately.

That is the record, Mr. President. Keep it dark. Do not bring it into the limelight, because people should not know. In the interest of national security, they are not to be trusted with these alleged secrets. I cannot help to recur to the fact that certainly until 9:45 this morning I felt like a class B Senator. Twenty-six Senators were entitled to listen to the testimony, and seventy Members of this body up to that time, certainly under the resolution adopted by the committee, were not entitled to attend the hearings.

It is strange business. I understand that one Member of this body said it would be fatal—fatal, Mr. President—to let the other Senators attend the hearings.

By some strange spiritual alchemy all that was changed this morning at 9:45. At that time a modification was made. Now, instead of only 26, all 96 Senators can attend the hearings. It is a strange business.

I am wondering why such a change of heart took place. There has been much political discussion on the other side of the aisle today. Of course, it has been implied or made to appear that our viewpoint on the matter is a political viewpoint. I wish to say—and I have said it a thousand times in my State—that I am a sort of reluctant Senator. I did not wish to come back, after I had walked out of this man's town in 1949. I was not too anxious to come back, Mr. President. But this much I do know. I have no political skin to protect. I am interested only in my God and in my country. That is all. I will go as far as anyone else in that field.

Mr. President, I think it is a tragic thing when, ever so often, either unwittingly or wittingly, the patriotism of Members of this body is brought into question. I certainly would not question anyone's fidelity to his country, or patriotism, because I cannot imagine that anyone would reach the position of representative of a great sovereign State in the sisterhood of States unless he had long before evidenced a sustained and enduring fidelity to his country which was beyond all question.

It has been said that everyone cannot be admitted to the hearings. Of course, that is true. Everyone cannot be admitted, any more than it is possible to admit all the people who want to buy a ticket to Oklahoma in one of the New York theaters. It is possible to accommodate only as many people as the theater will hold. The point is that the theater is open. If a man will stay in line long enough and take his chance, and perhaps stay up all night and bring his breakfast along, he may be able to get in. It is the chance to get in, and hear what is going on which is important, not whether he actually gets in. I say to my good friend from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPLE] that if the junior Senator from Illinois keeps his position on the

floor, he may not get over to the hearings. I hope to be able to do so. It is not important whether I get there; but it is important that I have a chance to get in when I get there, in open competition with all others who would like to get in. That is the important thing.

With respect to open hearings, I affirm and reaffirm that I do not want to say to a father, who has a son in his family about to go into uniform, "By legislative fiat you cannot come in." If limitation of space prevents him from getting in, or perhaps transportation, if he is off in some far corner of the world, that is one thing. At least the opportunity was made available to him.

From time to time over the radio and by means of other forms of communication we have admonished the American people that they must be willing to endure sacrifices in a critical time. We ask them to make sacrifices, but we keep them in the dark. Some time ago when the Secretary of the Treasury was in Paris he was quoted as having said that we must admonish our people to accept a philosophy of austerity. That is all very well. Our people are willing to accept it. But let us say to them, "We will match you in sacrifice. We will play the game. We will be fair. We will let the light shine in so that, as taxpayers, as the fathers or mothers of sons who may be called for military service, you will know, within proper limits, what is going on." That is all I ask. That is the reason why I am in favor of the resolution. I abhor secrecy.

It may be asked, "Well, didn't you serve on committees in the House a long time ago, and didn't you bar people from hearings?" Certainly; but as a matter of fact, if anyone had made the attempt, I am confident he could have gotten into many of the Appropriations Committee hearings.

As I recall, when I was on the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Legislative Branch we fought that issue out for many days. I for one certainly would have gone along with the idea of admitting people to hearings. There was only one reason, after all, why anyone and everyone was not welcome. It was feared that if the general public were admitted they would get an earfull, and then come around the lobby members of the Appropriations Committees for increased appropriations. If that is all the reason that can be cited, it is as good as no reason at all, because a man who serves on that committee and is charged with some responsibility over Government spending is expected to be able to stand up against representations of that kind. That is a rather hollow and pretentious argument.

Mr. President, I desire to be counted upon the side of the people in this argument, because there is nothing I can see to fear. The men who will occupy the witness chair have fine minds. They know what security means, and their answers will be such as to give no comfort or aid to the enemy. Let us treat them as men who have as much interest in the security of the country as has anyone else, and particularly those who are Members of this body.

That is all I have to say on the subject, Mr. President.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have been much interested in the remarks of Senators with reference to the pending motion. I have been even more interested in the remarks of Senators with reference to a vast field of subjects beyond the scope of the motion. I have been much interested in statements from Senators which would seem to express the opinion on their part that the hearings now in progress before the Joint Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate are being suppressed; that the questions and answers are being skimmed off, and that the people are being given only such information as Members of the Senate, or those charged with the responsibility of deleting that which would be of benefit to the enemy, might deem proper.

I am a little surprised at those statements, which amount to accusations against the good faith of the committees now conducting these hearings. It has been made crystal clear by those committees, acting through their chairmen and on their own, that it is their purpose to give to the American people, as fast as it is mechanically possible to disseminate it, every vestige of information obtained in those hearings, save only that which might be of aid and comfort to the enemy.

I have been much interested in the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not catch the last statement, about aiding the enemy. Will the Senator please repeat what he said?

Mr. KERR. I ask the reporter to read it to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is not accusing anyone on this side of the aisle of giving aid to the enemy, is he?

Mr. KERR. I must say that if what the Senator has heard, and the question he has asked, together with the reading of the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma would excite his curiosity to the extent that he would listen to the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma, this little byplay might be of some service.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I always listen to his remarks. That is the reason I wanted to be sure of what he said.

Mr. KERR. The reporter is about to read it.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator does not want to repeat it, it is all right with me.

Mr. KERR. The reporter is about to read it; and if the Senator does not want to listen to it, it is all right with me.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator does not remember it, very well. I doubt if he remembers very much that he says.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that if the Senator desires to have certain remarks read by the Reporter, the Chair will so direct.

Mr. KERR. That is the desire of the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. President. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Reporter will read the remarks referred to. The Official Reporter (Gregor Macpherson) read as follows:

I am a little surprised at those statements, which amount to accusations against the good faith of the committees now conducting these hearings. It has been made crystal clear by those committees, acting through their chairmen and on their own, that it is their purpose to give to the American people, as fast as it is mechanically possible to disseminate it, every vestige of information obtained in those hearings, save only that which might be of aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, that illustrates what has been going on in this debate. The Senator from Nebraska was present in body. I do not know where his mind was. Perhaps that was with his thoughts, and they were far away.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Let me finish this very eloquent dissertation.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly was not in Oklahoma, where the wind blows.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma has not yielded.

Mr. KERR. But after returning, either to complete consciousness of what was going on, or to some semblance of it, he seemed to have an intimation that something had been said here about aiding and abetting the enemy. I would not say that "the wicked flee when no man pursueth." I would not say that, Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator is charging me with aiding the enemy, I am going to make a point of order. That is what I want to know.

Mr. KERR. If and when I charge the Senator with aiding and abetting the enemy, I will invite him to make the point of order.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly will. The Senator will not have to invite me.

Mr. KERR. But until I do, it seems to me that either the Senator from Nebraska is incapable of understanding, or unwilling to understand, what the Senator from Oklahoma says.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator made that charge about the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] earlier in the day, or one similar to it. Believe me, this is the last time the Senator is going to make it when I am on the floor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am going to refer to that in a few moments, and then I shall let the Record speak as to what was said.

It is amazing to me, Mr. President, that Senators make bald statements with reference to events between which and the actual record there is often little, if any, factual connection, and then beat their breasts in defense of accusations which were not made, or in support of contentions which have not been stated and which could not be substantiated.

I started to say, Mr. President, that the Senator from Nebraska had made the statement on the floor—and I want him to listen, and, if I make an error, I invite him to correct it—that he had been present at much of the hearing this morning and that he was certain that nothing had been said there while he was present which could possibly be of any value to the enemy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is incorrect. I never mentioned the words "value to the enemy" or "aid to the enemy."

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator state substantially what he did say, if he may do so without my losing the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, sir; I remember what I said, and I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma what it was. I said I attended the hearing this morning for a comparatively short time. I was not there at the beginning and I had to leave at about 11:30; and I said during the time I was present at the hearing there was nothing General MacArthur said which could not have been disclosed to the American people without endangering the national security. That may not represent the exact words, but it is in substance what I said. I said nothing about giving aid to the enemy, nor did I make any remarks of the kind the Senator uses so frequently.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator; but I must say that when he referred to remarks which might endanger the national security, that seemed to the Senator from Oklahoma to have some relationship to words which would give aid and comfort to the enemy. Certainly they have a similar meaning in the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma. In order that there may be no doubt about it I want to read what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] said about that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is perfectly agreeable to the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator from Oklahoma can say anything he wants to about what the Senator from Michigan said. But the Senator from Oklahoma is not contending for one moment, is he, that the Senator from Nebraska is giving aid to the enemy?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am not going to say: "The wicked flee when no man pursueth."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from Oklahoma is out of order. He is impugning the good character and patriotism of the junior Senator from Nebraska. I make that point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no power under the rules to pass on that question.

Mr. WHERRY. I make the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska makes the point of order

that the Senator from Oklahoma is out of order.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma will take his seat.

Mr. KERR took his seat.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Oklahoma may be permitted to proceed in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware that the Senator from Oklahoma be permitted to proceed in order. The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma will proceed in order.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as I said a while ago, if and when the Senator from Oklahoma should choose to impugn the motives or the patriotism of the Senator from Nebraska he will give the Senator due notice and suggest that he make the point of order.

I must say, Mr. President, that I know of no one on this floor against whom I would make such a charge. And among the men on this floor there is none for whose patriotism I have more respect than I do for that of the Senator from Nebraska. Strange as it may seem, Mr. President, and one of the mysteries of my brief experience in this body, I have a great affection for the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes, I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That has been mutual, has it not?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma would like to answer that it is.

Mr. WHERRY. Go ahead and answer in that way. That is perfectly all right with me. I have no objection.

Mr. KERR. I have some feeling of sadness that the Senator from Nebraska has made the statement in the past tense.

Mr. WHERRY. I will include the future tense. I will include all the tenses.

Mr. KERR. I wonder if the Senator from Nebraska will include the present tense.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

(Laughter in the galleries.)

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries that this is a "tense situation," and he asks them to preserve order.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma wants to reinforce the remark of the Vice President, because when it gets to the point where the Senator from Nebraska repeatedly expresses fear of the existence of something for which, so far as the Senator from Oklahoma is concerned, there has been neither thought nor contemplation nor the possibility of substance, then the Senator from Oklahoma must say that it is becoming rather tense—but certainly not on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The other day, after a little debate in the Senate, the press, through some quirk of journalistic or photographic curiosity, asked the Senator from Oklahoma if there were those on the other side of the aisle with whom he would be willing to have his picture made. The

Senator from Oklahoma said there were quite a number, but the number one choice of the Senator from Oklahoma would be his delightful and charming, though occasionally misguided, friend, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. There has been no departure from that attitude on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma insofar as the Senator from Nebraska is concerned. Let me say to him that under no circumstances will the Senator from Oklahoma cast any reflection upon his high and noble patriotism which the Senator from Oklahoma not only acknowledges, but happily confirms.

Now, if I may refer to what the Senator said, without creating any doubt, I will proceed along the line at which I had thought I had arrived when the Senator made the point of order that took the Senator from Oklahoma off his feet.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan earlier today made this statement:

The Senator from Michigan does not know what the committee has in mind bringing out. The Senator from Michigan can only say what he heard this morning. The Senator from Michigan will say at this moment that he did not hear anything which he believes would affect the security of the United States.

It is the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska had made a statement of somewhat similar import on this floor. With reference to those two statements, the Senator from Oklahoma reminds the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that the one charged with making deletions from the testimony given before the committees had a different viewpoint.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not charge anyone in the committee with deleting anything intentionally. When the distinguished Senator from Florida was talking about skimming off the cream, I said to him, "It seems to me that if some person is allowed to make public only what he wants to have published, the cream is skimmed off and all the facts are not made available to the public." What the Senator from Oklahoma has said certainly has no reference to my statement because I have not charged anyone with intentionally deleting any evidence.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma did not say so. He did not say that the Senator from Nebraska said that.

Mr. WHERRY. It certainly is possible of being interpreted in that way. Furthermore, I was present at the committee hearing only a part of the time. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma may be of the opinion that during all the time the general testified he may have made some remarks or some observations which the Senator from Oklahoma feels it would not be in the interest of national security to make public. I want it clearly understood that I was not present all the time, as was the

Senator from Oklahoma, apparently, nor was the Senator from Michigan. But I reiterate that during the time I was present there was not anything said by the general which the people of America should not know. It would be well if they could know what he said, and it would not violate national security for it to be made public. That is my opinion.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I should love to yield, but wish to say one more word about the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska. What the Senator from Oklahoma was saying was that the person charged with the responsibility of deleting from the record information which might be adverse to the national security did not agree with the statement of the Senator from Michigan, nor did he agree with the Senator from Nebraska. I understand that a naval commander representing the Joint Chiefs at the hearing is responsible for deleting from the testimony, before it is made available for publication, information which could be of possible value to the enemy or could be of probable damage to the national security. The record shows that a number of deletions were made from the answers of General MacArthur, in which he discussed certain numerical elements of strength and certain probabilities and purposes and programs of our Government and estimates regarding the Soviet Government.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I have promised to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Oklahoma permit me to make a slight correction of the Record at this time?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if it is true that the information being presented in the course of the hearing before the committee in the caucus room is available to the press and the public within a very short time after the statements are made in that room, with the exception of matters which may be deleted by a security agent.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for the question. The answer is yes, the information is made available just as quickly as it is mechanically possible to do so.

I shall read to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska a question which was asked this morning of General MacArthur by the chairman of the committee, and General MacArthur's reply:

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Joint Chiefs ever suggest in addition to the reconnaissance that these bases be attacked?

General MACARTHUR. Not that I know of, Senator; the only order I had was not to attack.

The remainder of the answer General MacArthur gave at that point was deleted, for security reasons.

Mr. President, I became interested in this matter because I sat there during the hearings. I must say that I am aware of my lack of preparation to pass

upon the question of just what information might be of value to the enemy or might be adverse to the national security. However, even with that consciousness, I was impressed a number of times with the feeling that certain information contained in the answers given by General MacArthur could not help but be of value to the enemy.

In that regard, Mr. President, let me say that I am advised that this morning the United Press carried a story that Tass, the Soviet news agency, has set up a direct special telephone wire from the United States Capitol to its downtown office. I am advised that never before has that been true in the history of our country. I do not claim to possess sufficient wisdom or ability to be able to analyze and know the reasons for that action, but this question arises in my mind: Is not it possible that Tass thought that certain information which might be available at the hearing would be of such significance or of such value that it should not even be permitted to take the normal routine of transmission, but that special facilities should be installed in order to transmit it—if the information were developed or if it were obtainable—in the quickest manner possible?

Mr. President, I would not be a party to keeping from the people of Oklahoma or from the people of the Nation a scintilla of information which is either of interest to them or is desired by them, unless I was convinced that for their welfare and for the security of my country some part of the information should be kept privileged to the military authorities, who are charged with the responsibility of the national security.

Mr. President, I have been unable to find myself impressed by the impassioned pleas of some Members of the Senate who have indicated that if they are not successful in their purpose, the people of the United States will be kept in darkness. One of my distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle last evening asked me if I did not want the people of Oklahoma to have this information. Mr. President, they are getting it just as quickly as the radio, the teletype, and the telegraph services can take it to them; and for whatever this information is worth, I am constrained to mention the fact that in my opinion they can read and can hear, and every bit of the information with reference to this hearing, aside from that which could damage their security, is being made available to them as quickly as it is humanly and mechanically possible to do so. The committee is charged with that responsibility.

I must say that it was after the committee had seen letters from certain Republican members of the committee, in which some of the most secret documents having to do with our national defense and our national security had been requested, that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], placed those letters in the Record. It is beyond my comprehension how men could fail to know that the information requested in those letters would be of the

utmost value to the enemies of our country, and that its publication would be of the greatest and severest damage to our national security.

Mr. President, the distinguished general who now is appearing before the committee has declined to indicate a desire that the hearings be made public, and well he may. He has been given permission by the Commander in Chief to go wherever he wishes to go, in about as convenient and, I may say, as luxurious and as rapid a means of transportation as is available on this earth. If the general has a message for the American people, every television station in the country is available to him, every radio station is available to him.

I must say that he has not hidden his light under a bushel, he has manifested no timidity of expression, no shyness in speaking his views, his recommendations, and his opinions. During such times as he may have been incapacitated or fatigued, I must say that he has had an aide who has shown remarkable facility and efficiency in issuing statements either by or for the general. I doubt whether the sun has set on a weekday since the general was relieved of his command that he has not spoken, and every word that he has uttered, so far as I know, certainly for publication, has been carried by every means of communication available. There has been neither an effort made, nor has there been a lack of effort, to encourage the general to speak his piece and say his words and declare his message around the world. I can understand why he declined to request that the hearings be made public.

Therefore, as I see it, the committee has acted, and by its action it has said that every bit of information brought out in its hearings, except only that which could possibly damage the national security, will be given instant and complete publication. The general has done that heretofore, and he has invited any group across the Nation who wanted him to appear before them to say so. I understand he made a public statement that he was available to go anywhere at any time his strength permitted and the opportunity presented.

In view of the fact that he has declined to indicate that he either wanted or thought there ought to be an open hearing, and in view of the fact that the committee has acted and has taken the position that the national security would be best served by not having an open meeting, and also that all the information, aside from that jeopardizing the national security, be made immediately available, the question comes to the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma. Why the resolution? By its terms, which I must say present contradictions, it provides that "no matters, the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open, public hearings."

The procedure being followed meets both the letter and the spirit of the resolution. That being true, the Senator from Oklahoma asks, Why the resolution? I can see no reason for the reso-

lution other than that, in the opinion of some, it would serve someone else's political welfare. In that regard, I may say that insofar as the political security of those who favor the resolution and those who oppose it are concerned, and aside from the evident damage which I think it would do to the national security, I should like to see it adopted and implemented, and let those who favor it take the responsibility for it. The people of the United States of America are not fooled by these gyrations of the Wherry-go-round.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to my good friend, the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator can surely trust the people, can he not?

Mr. KERR. Yes, thank God, I can.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why does the Senator not wish to give them the facts?

Mr. KERR. They are getting the facts as fast as they can be gotten, and the Senator from Nebraska knows it.

Mr. President, I now desire to address myself briefly to the accusation made by the Senator from Michigan against the Senator from Oklahoma. The Senator from Michigan, on the floor of the Senate, a little while ago, speaking of the Senator from Oklahoma, said:

The Senator knows that what he says is an absolute falsehood. He knows it. There is no doubt about it. He accuses the Senator from Michigan of wanting to give aid and comfort to the enemy, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I submit that, from the RECORD, that statement is not true.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I know that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma wants to be fair. Why does he not insert the first part of the colloquy?

Mr. KERR. I am going to.

Mr. WHERRY. Why does he not put in the RECORD what he, himself, said?

Mr. KERR. I am going to.

Mr. WHERRY. Why did the Senator not do it before he began his references to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma realizes that he is a very junior Senator, and that probably, of all the men on this floor, none is so wise, none is so capable of presenting a matter, as is the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska. But he should not expect the Senator from Oklahoma, in the brief time that he has been here, to have developed the efficiency which the Senator from Nebraska possesses in that regard.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. In just a moment. The Senator from Oklahoma wants to say that he realizes that he often stumbles, but he knows what he is trying to do, and he wishes that he could feel that to be equally true of others on the Senate floor, and he assures the Senator from Nebraska that he is going to do the very best he can in this regard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. He will even enroll in a correspondence course, if the Senator from Nebraska will—

Mr. WHERRY. If I will teach him?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator will offer me such a course at a reasonable fee, on the subject of how Senators should present matters they are trying to submit to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to quit stumbling around; just put it all in the RECORD. That is all I want. The Senator knows how to do it. He is an able lawyer, and he knows that many times in the court room things which it is desired the jury should know are put in the record. That is only fair. The Senator said he was going to put the first part of the colloquy into the RECORD, but up to the time the Senator from Nebraska asked him to place it in the RECORD he certainly had not done so. I think it is all right to quote what the Senator from Michigan said. That is the privilege of the Senator from Oklahoma; it is within the province of any Senator. But certainly if the Senator from Oklahoma is going to quote what the Senator from Michigan said, he should also insert what brought about the remark.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as the Senator from Oklahoma said a while ago, he intends to do that. He is in some doubt as to whether the Senator from Nebraska merely wants him to do that, or whether the Senator from Nebraska feels that by insinuation, questioning, and repeating he might throw the Senator from Oklahoma off balance. I want to say to him that so far as it is possible I am going to be like the boy who was asking for a job. A farmer had gotten a little behind with his work and advertised for a boy to help him. A number of boys came and applied for the job. The farmer said, "I am going to tell you boys a story. A while back I heard the hens cackling at the henhouse, and I figured that an owl had been getting some of my chickens, and I went to see if I could get the owl. I eased up as quietly as I could to where the chickens were, and I saw an owl sitting up a little above them, and I knew he was getting ready to swoop down on the chickens. I lifted my trusty old shotgun and fired. Just as I did, lightning struck the barn and set it afire. I rushed into the house and called the fire department and asked them to come out and help put out the fire. The fire department came and neighbors came, and, after a long, hard struggle, we got the fire under control and held the damage down to as small an amount as was possible."

The boys were listening with wide eyes, and one of them said, "Did it burn the chicken house down, too?"

The farmer replied, "Not all of it."

Another boy asked, "Did the fire department get here first, or did the neighbors get here first?"

The farmer replied, "The fire department came first."

There was a little freckle-faced kid there who had not yet said a word.

Then he inquired, "Mister, did you kill the owl?"

The farmer said, "Son, you are hired. You have enough sense to keep your mind on the main business." [Laughter.]

That is what the Senator from Oklahoma is trying to do. I must say he is not interested in watering last year's crop nor in the diversionary tactics of the Senator from Nebraska, although the Senator from Oklahoma does enjoy them. But he wants to keep his mind on the main business of this particular moment, namely, the accusation by the Senator from Michigan that the Senator from Oklahoma is a liar. He wants to refer to the record upon which that accusation was based:

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator has described some tragic events where great effort was evidently made to obtain some of the secret information with reference to the security of this country.

Mr. President, there is nothing in those words that accuses the Senator from Michigan of wanting to give aid and comfort to the enemy. Then the Senator from Oklahoma said:

Is the Senator not aware that what he here and now proposes would make it possible for the information to reach the enemy without his having to go to so much trouble?

Mr. President, that is a question; that is not an allegation. That is an inquiry; that is not an accusation.

Then the Senator from Oklahoma said:

I wonder if he is seeking to make it easier for him?

Mr. President, I must say that as I read the RECORD it consists, first, of a statement that did not refer to the Senator from Michigan. Then it consists of a question, and then it consists of the expression of a doubt on the basis of which the Senator from Michigan said:

The Senator knows that what he says is an absolute falsehood. He knows it. There is no doubt about it. He accuses the Senator from Michigan of wanting to give aid and comfort to the enemy, Mr. President.

I then tried to interrupt him to correct the impression, and the Senator said:

I will not yield, Mr. President.

I think I know why the Senator from Michigan said what he did. I do not think he wanted to answer the question of the Senator from Oklahoma. I do not think he wanted to meet the argument of the Senator from Oklahoma. So he took refuge, first, in an accusation which every Senator knows is in violation of the rules of the Senate, but in view of the fact that the Senator from Oklahoma hopes to live a while and remain in this august body a while, and in view of the fact that basing his judgment on what he has seen he is convinced that there will be many times when the Senator from Michigan will have no answer to a question or no argument to give and will take refuge either in refusing to yield or in saying something which differs from the real situation, the Senator from Oklahoma saw no profit to be had

in calling the Senator from Michigan to order.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the resolution under discussion could not possibly be of service to the American people, because they are getting every bit of information they would get if the resolution were adopted and carried out in letter and in spirit; in view of the fact that General MacArthur has the opportunity to say what he wants to say at any time, at any place, and in any manner, and in view of the fact that he himself declined to take the responsibility to do that which the advocates of this resolution seek to do, the Senator from Oklahoma wonders why the resolution is pressed.

Because of the fact that there seems to be doubt in men's minds as to what the Senator from Oklahoma thinks the reason is, I should like to explain. I do not think there is a Senator on the floor who would deliberately injure the welfare of this country or give aid and comfort to an enemy of this country. The Senator from Oklahoma gives every Member of the Senate the same high regard with reference to his patriotism as his feelings are with reference to his own. But the Senator from Oklahoma does not have the same high opinion of the judgment of some of the Members of this body. In the minds of those who would be fair there might be justification for the conclusion by the Senator from Oklahoma that he did not think much of the judgment of the Senator from Michigan. I spent some little time last night, Mr. President, addressing myself to a remark by the Senator from Michigan in which he said:

The Senator from Michigan does not know what the Senator from Oklahoma thinks.

He went on to state that he did not know whether the Senator from Oklahoma was "even at this moment capable of thinking."

Then the Senator from Michigan stated:

Judging from what the Senator is saying, there is some doubt about that in the mind of the Senator from Michigan.

Naturally, Mr. President, for a man to make public issue of his belief that the Senator from Oklahoma is incapable of thinking would create some doubt in the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma as to the good judgment of the person entertaining a feeling that would lead him to make such a statement.

I remember also when the Senator from Michigan made the positive statement on the floor that during World War II China had attacked and made war upon Japan. I must say that that did not improve my opinion of his judgment. He made the statement, Mr. President, that at that time Russia had a treaty with Japan similar to the one that Russia now has with China. In view of the fact that there is no basis for the statement, I must say that such positive allegation by the Senator from Michigan caused me to have further doubt as to the quality of his judgment. The fact of the matter is that the agreement he referred to was not what he said it was, and was not entered until 1941, which was many years after the

war between Japan and China had started and had been going on, as a result of Japan's making aggressive warfare against China.

I submit that it is not unreasonable, in view of such miscalculations or, as the Senator from Michigan has described them, situations in which he misspoke himself under the heat of argument, that the Senator from Oklahoma cannot develop too high an opinion of the judgment of the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Oklahoma wonders just how much heat it takes to get the Senator from Michigan in a state of mind where he misspeaks himself.

It would seem, Mr. President, that a man might not be safe on the floor of the Senate if he disagreed with the Senator from Michigan and asked him a question. I know that if he ever developed any self-confidence he might really be the exception to the rule. But while few generals get to be statesmen, even fewer statesmen get to be generals.

The Senator from Oklahoma is of the opinion that the entire record of the Senator from Michigan is replete with instances which justify lack of confidence on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma in the judgment of the Senator from Michigan. Some day I hope to review the story of the Howard Hughes inquiry. If and when I have the time to water a few of last year's crops, to which so many of our distinguished colleagues on the other side have devoted so much time, I will show wherein my confidence in the judgment of the senior Senator from Michigan was weakened even then.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like again to make the RECORD clear that all my remarks with reference to the Senator from Michigan, aside from the complimentary remarks which I made with reference to the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], have been spoken with reference to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggesting the absence of a quorum so that I may make a short statement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. KERR. Without losing the floor and the opportunity to suggest the absence of a quorum, I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator withholds his suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I have a clipping from today's Wall Street Journal entitled "Drastic Steel Quota Cut Looms for Rail Cars, Other Transport—NPA May Slash July Allocation 35%; Feels Program Unduly Draining Supply." The story goes on to state that the Defense Production Administration was reported to have given preliminary approval to a reduction of 35 percent—more than one-third—in the quantity of steel to be allocated for

freight car production beginning in July.

Mr. President, any such reduction would be ridiculous and short-sighted in the extreme, in my judgment. Without adequate rail transportation, it would be absolutely impossible for this country either to fight a war or rearm to prevent one. The railroads are the backbone of our transportation, and in fact, of our entire economic system. This country simply cannot function without an adequate supply of boxcars.

The news story to which I have referred carries a hint that this reduction in steel for boxcars is being pushed at the instigation of those interested in maintaining production of automobiles at a higher level. If that is the reason, it is certainly a foolish reason. There is today an all-time record number of automobiles in use. On the other hand, the number of boxcars has steadily declined year by year. At the beginning of this year, there were 20,000 fewer boxcars suitable for grain than at the beginning of 1949, 2 years previous.

As the able Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] reported yesterday, the critical shortage of boxcars in the grain area has temporarily eased up, but we all know it cannot last. We have barely gotten the elevators in the Middle West unblocked, now that a new harvest is about to start. The wheat harvest in Nebraska will start in just about a month. Unless some prompt and effective action is taken, it is absolutely certain that we shall be confronted with another crisis this summer and fall during the harvest season, with elevators blocked and grain lying in the fields because there is no place to put it.

The only solution to the boxcar situation is to construct more boxcars. That will take steel and other material, but there is no more essential industry in this country.

Mr. President, a few weeks ago I submitted Senate Resolution 89, authorizing the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make a full and complete study in order to make sure that sufficient materials were available for the production of 120,000 railroad cars during the calendar year 1951, or 10,000 a month. That is the absolute minimum that we need. In fact, even that will not be nearly enough to meet the critical situation we are facing.

Mr. President, I urge in the strongest possible terms that the committee proceed with such an investigation. It is becoming apparent that some of those in the emergency agencies do not realize the seriousness and importance of the railroad problem, and I believe it is time for Congress to take a hand.

I might add, Mr. President, that the other problem on which action should be taken promptly is an increase in the per diem rate. Under present conditions, a railroad which has cars constructed is likely to lose money on them by being forced, in effect, to rent them out to other railroads at the standard per diem rate of \$1.75 a day. So long as the per diem rate is so low, it is not surprising that there is a chronic shortage of boxcars.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the clipping from the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRASTIC STEEL QUOTA CUT LOOMS FOR RAIL CARS, OTHER TRANSPORT—NPA MAY SLASH JULY ALLOCATION 35 PERCENT; FEELS PROGRAM UNDULY DRAINING SUPPLY

(By Max Barnes)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The Defense Production Administration was reported today to have given its tentative approval to a ruthless paring of July steel allocations for several special programs, as exclusively revealed in yesterday's Journal of Commerce.

The allocations are being prepared by the National Production Authority.

The freight-car program, it was disclosed, probably will be the hardest hit; it faces a 35 percent reduction from the 308,000 tons of steel allocated for June.

OTHER PROGRAMS AFFECTED

Other big programs, including barges and possibly other transportation items, also are threatened with sharp reductions, according to informed officials. The final decision, however, has not yet been made.

Behind the threatened cuts is the growing belief among Government planners that special programs for defense and defense-supporting industries are taking too big a chunk of the Nation's steel production.

While these programs theoretically will be under the Controlled Materials plan starting July 1, officials said that specific July allocations must be made in routine fashion to assure deliveries. Later, when CMP starts functioning, the CMP allocations will be superimposed on these special program allocations.

The sharp cutback for freight cars has been under consideration for several weeks, but supporters of the program were able to maintain the 10,000-car allocation rate for June.

If the reduction is approved, it will be on the theory that the pinch according to some officials, would be felt only in period of peak transportation demands, such as for moving the grain crops.

The April freight car production is estimated at 8,200 cars and officials anticipated that the May program will be higher with the 10,000-car goal possible in June providing the steel already allocated is delivered on schedule.

Strong pressure for the reduction reportedly has come from automobile manufacturers who will be cut back to 70 percent of their 1950 production rates starting in July. Steel manufacturers also reportedly would favor reductions in special program requirements that would ease the pinch to their longtime customers.

Meanwhile, the Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co., one of the Nation's largest car builders, reported today that it will build 2,667 new freight cars in April for the highest production in 3 years. It estimated that May production will be up, possibly close to 3,000.

Champ Carry, chairman of the board, said in making the announcement that the April production could not have been achieved without the steel allocation program.

The total announced allocation to special programs for June was just under 1.4 million tons of processed steel, but officials admit that total programing runs above the 2 million-ton mark. The May allocation was about 200,000 tons less.

Any cut in the freight-car program is sure to touch off a wave of protest in Congress as well as in the railroad industry. Farm-State Congressmen have been pointing out the dangers of a serious freight car shortage

in the grain and cotton belts this year, and have backed the 10,000-a-month car-building program.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

OPEN HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS—RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have a notation before me which I am informed is correct. It comes over the news ticker. It reads as follows:

Senators reported that the committees agreed to suspend questioning of General MacArthur at 6 p. m. today, with no session Friday.

After some discussion, the general said he could return some day next week.

I see no purpose in the Senate working through another night session, when there will be plenty of time to do business tomorrow. If we should call Senators back into the Chamber at this time, it would only interrupt the work of the hearing. Senators are in attendance at the hearing, not here. So I make the motion—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will not the majority leader permit us to get a vote on the motion tonight?

Mr. McFARLAND. In view of the announcement which I have read, I cannot see that it would serve any purpose for the Senate to have a second night session. I have no objection to a vote this afternoon, but I do object to remaining in session for another night. That is what insisting on a vote today would mean.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to interrupt the distinguished majority leader. I realize that, now that he has been recognized, he can make a motion to recess or to adjourn. However, I appeal to the distinguished majority leader. I am sure that the debate on the motion is over. We have debated it for a couple of days. If we could have a vote on this issue we could decide it once and for all. I appeal to the distinguished majority leader to let us have a vote.

Mr. McFARLAND. If it would accomplish anything, it would be different; but I cannot see how we can accomplish anything by having a night session.

So, Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dworshak	Langer
Bennett	Ellender	McCarran
Brewster	Frear	McFarland
Butler, Md.	Hayden	Malone
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Martin
Carlson	Hill	Millikin
Case	Hoey	Monroney
Clements	Holland	Neely
Cordon	Jumpsey	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kerr	Underwood
Douglas	Kilgore	Wherry

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE and Mr. WILLIAMS answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. IVES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. GILLETTE, and Mr. MCCLELLAN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a further delay, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KEM, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NIXON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent. If present, the previously listed Senators would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—42

Anderson	Hoey	Maybank
Benton	Holland	Monroney
Byrd	Humphrey	Moody
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kefauver	Pastore
Frear	Kerr	Robertson
Fulbright	Kilgore	Russell
Gillette	Long	Smathers
Green	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McFarland	Sparkman
Hennings	Mckellar	Stennis
Hill	McMahon	Underwood

NAYS—39

Aiken	Ecton	Millikin
Bennett	Ferguson	Morse
Brewster	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Nixon
Bridges	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Kem	Schoepfel
Butler, Nebr.	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cain	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Lodge	Thye
Case	McCarran	Wherry
Cordon	McCarthy	Wiley
Dirksen	Malone	Williams
Dworschak	Martin	Young

NOT VOTING—15

Capehart	George	O'Connor
Chavez	Hunt	Taft
Duff	Jenner	Tobey
Eastland	Lehman	Watkins
Flanders	Magnuson	Welker

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 4, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 3 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, and Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be captains

Margaret K. Aldrich, ANC, N772113.
Elizabeth R. Perry, ANC, N797300.

To be first lieutenants

Dolores L. Evanson, WMSC, M2810.
Genevieve Lescaak, WMSC, M1125.

To be second lieutenants

Jean C. Altenburger, WAC, L1010260.
Clarissa L. Aping, WAC, L1010279.
Alice M. Barr, WAC, L1010258.
Eva M. Benson, WAC, L1010264.
Frances J. Biddle, WAC, L1010267.
Patricia L. Bouldin, WAC, L1010261.
Barbara J. Brown, WAC, L1010263.
Eva M. Burgess, WAC, L1010255.
Salona Butler, WAC, L1010278.
Helen R. Coplen, WAC, L1010273.
Vivian E. Davis, WAC, L1010276.
Irene S. Ebel, WAC, L1010274.
Irene Evans, WAC, L1010256.
Pola L. Garrett, WAC, L1010238.
Irene S. Gullede, WAC, L1010244.
Ruth Holland, WAC, L1010233.
Janet A. Jawelak, WAC, L1010237.
Shirley J. Justice, WAC, L1010250.

Esther E. Lenox, WAC, L1010270.
Sonja G. Lunoe, WAC, L1010241.
Kitt M. MacMichael, WAC, L1010245.
Phyllis J. Morsman, WAC, L1010259.
Patricia J. Pomeroy, WAC, L1010272.
Dorothy Sherba, WAC, L1010275.
Jacquelyn R. Sollars, WAC, L1010257.
Barbara J. Wardell, WAC, L1010282.
Helen A. Way, WAC, L1010280.
Martha L. Weeks, WAC, L1010269.
Elizabeth A. Whitaker, WAC, L1010281.
Kathleen I. Wilkes, WAC, L1010234.
Sadie E. Yoshizaki, WAC, L1010236.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Robert M. Griffin, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Rear Adm. Alfred E. Montgomery, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Rear Adm. Arthur C. Miles, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, who art the source of our material and spiritual blessings, grant that daily we may be strengthened within in order that we may cope victoriously with all circumstances and conditions without no matter how trying and difficult they may be.

We thank Thee for the priceless principles of our democracy, the authority of conscience, the sovereignty of the people, the equality of all men, and many others which we have received as a glorious heritage.

Make us more eager and able to retain these principles and to safeguard them against all enemies whether within or outside the borders of our beloved country.

May our chosen representatives and all our citizens discharge their duties intelligently and faithfully, fill us with desires to widen the horizons of our sympathy and understanding and deepen within the heart of humanity, the spirit of good will and brotherhood.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GEN. MATTHEW RIDGWAY

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest fighting men we have produced in this age, a man who is filling the biggest single job in our Military Establishment, is still wearing only three stars and he is clearly doing a four-star job. Lt. Gen. Matt Ridgway went to Korea, took a beaten army, regrouped it, reforged its fighting spirit, led it to triumphs which